DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 426 294 CE 078 014

AUTHOR	Askov, Eunice N.
TITLE	Evaluation Report of the Wisconsin Technical College System National Workplace Literacy Program Grant.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Inst. for the Study of Adult Literacy.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC. National Workplace Literacy Program.
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	186p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; Basic Skills; Educational Benefits; Inplant Programs; *Participant Satisfaction; Program Evaluation; School Business Relationship; *Skill Development; *Technical Institutes; *Transfer of Training; Two Year Colleges; *Workplace Literacy
IDENTIFIERS	*Wisconsin Technical College System

ABSTRACT

An external evaluator worked with the project team of the Wisconsin Technical College System National Workplace Literacy Program to develop the evaluation design. Although she was at the project site for only limited periods of time, she and the project team maintained periodic contact during the 3-year period by telephone, fax, and email. Three technical colleges were selected for onsite study. During each site visit, the evaluator met with college coordinators, instructors, business and labor partners, supervisors, and learners. The evaluation design was planned primarily as a naturalistic inquiry that used the structured interview approach to data collection. The Kirkpatrick model (1994) was used to guide the summative evaluation. Project staff decided on procedures to collect data used as evidence for accomplishment of each of four levels of evaluation: stakeholder evaluation, mastery of basic skills, transfer of learning, and impact on organizations. Evaluation highlights were business institutionalization of their programs; a culture shift in many businesses with workers valued as equals in decision making; and dissemination through newsletters targeted to workers in the business site. (The six-page report is followed by these extensive appendixes: program benefits handbook; structured interview forms for partners, supervisors, learners, and staff; interview data; and analysis of trends in the data.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 426 294

INSTITUTE
FOR THE STUDY
OF ADULT
LITERACY

EVALUATION REPORT OF THE WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM NATIONAL WORKPLACE LITERACY PROGRAM GRANT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PENNSTATE

College of Education
102 Rackley Building

University Park, PA 16802-3202
814-863-3777

ED 428 014

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EVALUATION REPORT OF THE WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM NATIONAL WORKPLACE LITERACY PROGRAM GRANT

Eunice N. Askov, Ph.D.
Professor of Education
Director, Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy
The Pennsylvania State University
102 Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 863-3777 (phone); (814) 863-6108 (fax)
ENA1@PSU.EDU (email)

EVALUATION REPORT OF THE WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM NATIONAL WORKPLACE LITERACY PROGRAM GRANT

Eunice N. Askov, Ph.D.
Professor of Education
Director, Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy
The Pennsylvania State University
102 Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 863-3777 (phone); (814) 863-6108 (fax)
ENA1@PSU.EDU (email)

This report is an independent evaluation of the three-year project granted to the Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS) under the National Workplace Literacy Program (NWLP) of the U. S. Department of Education. The external evaluator was engaged at the beginning of the project. While she did not influence the statement of the project objectives, she did work with the project team from the outset to develop the evaluation design. The involvement of the project stakeholders upfront in the evaluation design has been widely recommended in the evaluation research literature as the optimal approach to evaluation.

The Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy at Penn State was contracted to provide the evaluation services. Dr. Eunice N. Askov, Institute Director and Professor of Education, was named the external evaluator. The contract was in the form of consulting days that would be devoted to the project. Two visits of three days duration each were planned for the first and third years. One three-day visit was planned for the second year of implementation. Consulting days for data analyses and writing were also provided for each year of the project. At the conclusion of each visit the external evaluator wrote a letter outlining commendations and recommendations. These letters were included in the project's annual reports to the U. S. Department of Education.

While the external evaluator was at the project site for only limited periods of time, she and the project team maintained periodic contact during the three-year period. Communication was handled throughout the project through telephone, fax, and email. Products and project updates were sent to the external evaluator periodically. Furthermore, informal visits with the project team occurred during various conferences, such as the Workplace Learning Conferences held in April in Milwaukee. She also heard presentations from the project team at various national conferences.

Because the project was dispersed in location at the 11 technical colleges with 20 business sites throughout the state, the external evaluator could not visit each college and its business sites. To compensate for this limitation, she provided an initial training session on evaluation for all college personnel and met individually with each of the eight remote colleges (coordinators, instructors, business and labor representatives) twice at the annual Workplace Learning Conferences in 1996 and 1997 in Milwaukee. Three technical colleges were selected for onsite study: Madison (Oscar Mayer Foods Corporation and Traex Division - Menasha Corporation), Blackhawk (Woodbridge Corporation), and Milwaukee (Northeast Milwaukee Industrial Development Corporation). During each site visit she met with the college coordinators, instructors, business and labor partners, supervisor, and learners.

Evaluation Design

The evaluation design was planned primarily as a naturalistic inquiry which used the structured interview approach to data collection. (Sample interview forms for partners, training directors/supervisors, learners, and project staff are provided in Appendix B.) The external evaluator interviewed all the project stakeholders during the scheduled visits over the three-year period to identify project strengths and recommendations for improvement. In addition the evaluator visited instructional sessions at various sites and provided feedback on the instruction that was observed. Thus, the project included both formative as well as summative evaluation.

The Kirkpatrick model (Kirkpatrick, D., 1994, *Evaluating Training Programs*, San Francisco, CA: Barrett-Koehler) was used as guidance to the evaluator and the project team for summative evaluation. Since the evaluator was not located near the project sites, and since she was contracted for a limited number of consulting days throughout the project, the data for the Kirkpatrick evaluation model were collected by the project team. Since project objectives had been stated upfront as part of the contract of the WTCS with the U. S. Department of Education, the accomplishment of these objectives was also monitored during the three-year project. (A detailed discussion of these is included in the *Final Report* of the WTCS.)

The remainder of this report is structured according to the approaches to evaluation that were conducted. At the conclusion of this narrative a holistic evaluation summary is provided.

Accomplishment of the Grant Objectives

The *Final Report* of the Wisconsin Technical College System to the U. S. Department of Education summarizes concisely the accomplishment of the grant objectives. The project objectives are described accurately. Evidence for their accomplishment is objectively provided. There is no need to repeat this aspect of the evaluation study here since it is provided in the project's *Final Report*; only highlights are provided in this section.

The Final Report also describes the setting for the project, namely in 11 technical colleges. In most locations workers were not released on the clock or paid for the time spent in learning centers. Instead, they attended before or after their shifts on their own time. In most sites they came to learning labs with computers and print instructional materials. In some sites the lab was open 24 hours per day so that they could come anonymously on their own even when the instructor was not present. The instructional model was typically individualized, self-paced learning based on the workers' individual needs that may or may not be work-related.

The project proactively attempted to use the data collection instrument provided and mandated by the U. S. Department of Education known as NWLIS. However, the numerous problems with the data collection system that were beyond the control of the project team meant that demographic data were not available for the students served.

Instead of summarizing the results obtained at each college site, this report discusses the NWLP project evaluation as a whole. The model is a decentralized one, similar to the one used by the state in distributing its workplace literacy funds. The technical colleges wrote proposals to the state board in order to participate in the NWLP project. Since most of the colleges had experienced personnel in working with business and industry, they were able to design programs that made sense on the local level.

The project team invested considerable effort in evaluating the project to supplement the efforts of the external evaluator. The technical colleges collected extensive data and created reports on the accomplishments at all four levels of Kirkpatrick's Hierarchy.

Evaluation Approach Using Kirkpatrick's Model

The evaluator provided an introductory inservice session to the project staff on the Kirkpatrick model. Using a handout which described the four levels of evaluation--satisfaction of all stakeholders, mastery of the skills taught, transfer of instruction to the workplace, and impact on the organizations--the staff then brainstormed how the levels could be used in data collection. They decided on procedures for collecting the data used as evidence for the accomplishment of each of the four levels of evaluation. Monitoring the data collection for these levels of evaluation served as a focal point for the external evaluator's subsequent visits.

The Center on Education and Work at the University of Wisconsin-Madison summarized the program benefits in a handout which is reproduced in Appendix A. While the accomplishments of only 13 of the 20 business sites are summarized, the list does show the extensive amount of impact of the NWLP project.

Each college collected its own evaluation data to measure the impact of the project. It was not feasible or advisable to collapse data across college sites since the business partners at the various colleges were so different. The colleges all collected *Level 1* data (satisfaction) from the various stakeholders through anonymous questionnaires that measured their reactions to the implementation of the NWLP project at local sites. The results of these questionnaires were similar to those collected by the external evaluator through interviews.

Level 2 data (mastery of basic skills) were collected at the business sites. Most of the colleges used competency-based assessments in which the teachers devised tests for the skills being taught; these were administered approximately every eight-ten hours of instruction. While this approach may lack reliability and sophistication of commercial standardized tests, it does assure that workers are assessed on what they are being taught. The computer programs used (for example, ModuMath and Plato) have assessments incorporated into the instruction that were also used to assess mastery of basic skills. Communication skills for ESL learners were occasionally measured by pre- and post-instruction tape recordings. Good progress was recorded on all the assessments. Course completion, such as in the blueprint reading class, was also deemed as indicating mastery of basic skills.

Level 3, transfer of learning, was assessed primarily by survey data. While this is difficult to measure, both supervisors and learners reported improvements in using basic skills on the job. Evidence was also found in promotions and improved attendance at work. Likewise, workers reported literacy improvements at home, such as being able to write to a distant relative, help children with homework, and calculate percentages and proportions for home use. Gains in self-esteem were frequently reported by the learners and supervisors alike as workers were better able to handle their jobs and home life.

Numerous *Level 4* observations of impact were reported by the various companies. In addition to employees earning GEDs and citizenship, others prepared for advanced training and for job/organizational change. One large unionized company reported that the safety incident rate was down, with management reporting that this accomplishment was due to a safety awareness program that was incorporated into the instruction in the learning center.

One plant recently attained QS9000 certification. The same company improved its scores on heath and safety audits and recently attained its first-ever perfect score on the audit. The plant manager attributed their achievements to the learning center activities. Workers at that plant reported that their experiences in the learning center enabled them to detect and report a difficulty in the manufacturing line, thus preventing a total shutdown that would have exceeded the company's entire three-year financial obligation to the program.

Another company used the program as part of its workman's compensation program. When workers are injured and cannot perform their assigned duties, they are reassigned to the learning center until they can resume their regular jobs. Both the company and the workers felt this was very beneficial. The company also reported that workers spent less time away from work, perhaps because they had something constructive to do during recovery.

The urban redevelopment project could serve as a model for serving the workforce needs of small companies in urban areas. The site consisted of a large computer learning center plus classrooms in a remodeled warehouse. Small businesses in the urban area that paid to participate in the project sent their workers to the learning center for various workshops and classes. Since the students were from different companies, the evaluation data had to be gathered largely by surveys of the students and companies. Data indicated that the site appeared to be successful in meeting the needs of both the workers and small businesses.

As one inspects the data that are reported, one can see that this was a highly effective statewide project. It is also clear that the data that are reported are honest--in other words, no claims are made for total mastery, transfer, or impact. However, it is clear that over the three-year project that a very positive impact was realized by all stakeholders. Therefore, in terms of the Kirkpatrick evaluation hierarchy, the project was judged to be highly effective.

Structured Interview Data Analysis

Qualitative analysis of the interview data collected by the external evaluator occurred with the assistance of a staff person at the Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy. The assistant entered the responses that were recorded by the external evaluator under each question in the structured interview forms (see Appendix B) into a Filemaker Pro Database. Using a database permitted the evaluator and the assistant to see trends in the data across time and across sites.

Some of the interviews were conducted in small groups, especially of learners. Others, such as with partners, were conducted individually. The project staff were not in attendance for most of the interviews with company stakeholders. These interview reports are provided in Appendix C. (The names of the individuals and companies are removed to protect confidentiality that was assured during the interviews.)

The analysis of trends is provided in Appendix D. It is apparent that all stakeholders were impressed by the changes that were evident in the learners. Often this anecdotal evidence convinced them of the worthwhile nature of the project. Learners also saw changes in themselves. They felt increased confidence and self-esteem. Many began other learning projects outside the company, for example, by taking classes at the technical college. Supervisors observed that the workers became more independent in their work.

Furthermore, the college staff viewed the project as a tremendous learning experience for themselves. Many became involved in the dissemination of the project, especially at the Workplace Learning Conferences in Milwaukee, which brought about professional growth

among the staff. Some of the business and labor partners also became actively involved in project dissemination which opened up new opportunities for them.

Evaluation Highlights

The fact that nine of the business sites have already institutionalized their programs (four in partnership with a college; five by hiring their own instructors) and six are institutionalizing the program during the 1998-99 academic year indicates the success of the project. (Five business sites dropped out during or after the three-year grant period.) The funds for future programming must be provided by the business sites since they are now not eligible for state funding.

Several aspects of this project are noteworthy of additional commentary. The NWLP grant was awarded to the Wisconsin Technical College System Board. Similar to the state grants for workplace literacy in Wisconsin, the NWLP 3-year grant required businesses to provide their match upfront in cash at 25% for the first year, 50% for the second year, and 75% for the third year. Since businesses had to provide a cash match, they did not use workers' released time from work as match as in many other NWLP projects. Therefore, the programs tended to be voluntary on the workers' own time rather than on the clock.

In many businesses essentially a culture shift occurred. Workers sat on the advisory boards with managers; their voices were valued as equals in decision-making. Since the unemployment rate is so low in Wisconsin, companies recognize the need to develop the workforce that they have. Companies began to think of lifelong learning and training as part of their business strategic plans. Similarly, the technical colleges recognized the importance of outreach to businesses in their communities as a trend of the future. In fact, most of the colleges had already created a business and industry unit to accommodate these outreach services.

Labor (Wisconsin State AFL-CIO) was a very strong partner in this project. At each business site one of the first steps in program development was the establishment of peer advisors and a representative advisory board. The role of the peer advisors was to recruit students by promoting the program throughout the business site and to provide ongoing feedback on how the program was being perceived among the workers. State labor personnel trained the peer advisors even in non-unionized plants. The system of peer advisors seemed to function very well. In only one instance was the evaluator told that the peer advisors who had worked well initially had ceased to be an effective force. It makes sense that they would have to be given ongoing training and energized periodically. It also seems logical that the peer advisors might have to change from time to time as workers' interests change.

Another unique dimension of this project was the involvement of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, specifically the Center on Education and Work. In addition to running an international conference in Milwaukee each spring--which brought visibility to the NWLP project--the Center developed useful tools for staff development. For example, the well-known WESA (Workplace Educational Skills Analysis) instrument was developed under an earlier NWLP grant, but extended and refined under the current grant. The WESA helps the company determine the skill needs of the local workforce and serves as the basis for training. (In fact, several companies paid additional funds to have extra WESAs conducted at their plants.) The Center on Education and Work also created many useful publications as part of the project, such as manuals of best practices in workplace literacy. The Center also played an active role in providing training during the semi-annual staff development meetings.

The fourth state partner was Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce. While they did not play as active a role as the other three partners, their presence undoubtedly assisted in recruiting businesses to join the project.

Another outstanding effort was dissemination. Most colleges created newsletters targeted to the workers in the business site. These newsletters created interest in the program and encouraged recruitment. The project has appeared on most national conference agendas that relate to workforce development. These presentations created national interest in the NWLP project and encouraged the project staff to excel in their efforts. Business partners were frequently included in the dissemination efforts, lending greater credibility to the presentations. More importantly, these sessions shared significant findings and strategies that have been subsequently adopted and adapted by other projects. This project, perhaps more than most others, has led to professionalism of the workforce development effort at the national level.

Finally, the organizing state structure was a tremendous benefit to this NWLP project. This structure not only supported the project staff through implementation of a common vision and design, but it also supported the staff development, evaluation, and dissemination efforts. Just as important, the state leadership from the Technical College System pushed for institutionalization from the beginning, ensuring that it would occur at the completion of the federal funding. For this reason this evaluator recommends that future national demonstration projects be channeled through the states to encourage the development of state support structures that ensure institutionalization of innovation.

APPENDIX A

Program Benefits Handbook

Center on Education and Work
University of Wisconsin-Madison

WISCONSIN WORKPLACE PARTNERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM BENEFITS

1994 - 1997

STATE PARTNERS

WISCONSIN MANUFACTURERS & COMMERCE
James S. Haney, President

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM BOARD
Edward Chin, State Director

CENTER ON EDUCATION AND WORK
University of Wisconsin-Madison
L. Allen Phelps, Director

WISCONSIN STATE AFL-CIO
David Newby, President

LOCAL PARTNERS

ARIENS COMPANY

Fox Valley Technical College

BORG INDAK, INC.

International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, District Lodge 10

Gateway Technical College

COLONIAL CRAFT

Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College

FISHER HAMILTON SCIENTIFIC INC.

United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Local 1533

International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, Local 175

Lakeshore Technical College

GEHL COMPANY

United Paperworkers International Union, Local 7579

Moraine Park Technical College

GREENHECK FAN CORPORATION

Sheet Metal Workers International Association, Local 565

Northcentral Technical College

KOHLER COMPANY

United Auto Workers, Local 833

Lakeshore Technical College

MARATHON ELECTRIC MANUFACTURING CORPORATION

International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 1791
Teamsters International

Northcentral Technical College

NORTHEAST MILWAUKEE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, Local 66

Milwaukee Area Technical College

OSCAR MAYER FOODS CORPORATION

United Food and Commercial Workers International Union, Local 538

Madison Area Technical College

TRAEX DIVISION - MENASHA CORPORATION

Madison Area Technical College

VOLLRATH COMPANY, INC.

United Auto Workers, Local 1472

Aluminum, Brick and Glass Workers International, Local 175

Lakeshore Technical College

WOODBRIDGE CORPORATION

Union of Needletrades, Industrial and Textile Employees, Local 1871

Blackhawk Technical College

WISCONSIN WORKPLACE PARTNERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM BENEFITS

Of the 13 worksites currently involved in the 1994-1997 Wisconsin Workplace Partnership Training Program, 11 sites plan to continue their workplace education programs after the grant funding ends. The majority of these sites are budgeting their post-grant programs at the current combined grant and private sector funding level or higher. This is perhaps the greatest testimony to the value of the Wisconsin Workplace Partnership Training Program. It is also significant to note that the remaining two sites will continue to provide training, but the format and the extent of the training is unknown at this time. A partial listing of the program benefits that partners at participating worksites reported is provided below.

BOTTOM-LINE SAVINGS

- Employees view the workplace education program as a benefit which helps to keep the turnover rate lower than the industry average and in turn means a bottom-line savings. *(Colonial Craft)*
- Every employee in the east plant was required to complete a 4½-hour hands-on course in measurement and gauging. As a result of the training, measuring accuracy improved company-wide and a reduction in rework produced documented savings. *(Gehl Company)*
- While employees receive worker's compensation, they participate in the workplace education program which brings them back to work sooner and saves the company money. *(Greenheck Fan Corporation)*
- By revamping the employee orientation program to include training identified through Workplace Educational Skills Analyses (WESAs), the overall training time for new employees is substantially less and the recruits are more productive earlier. A new facility in another state implemented this model and it resulted in a much faster start-up. *(Greenheck Fan Corporation)*
- The safety incidents are lower as a direct result of the workplace education program. Instructors provide safety information at monthly meetings, create crossword puzzles based on new safety terms, and coordinate monthly prize drawings from the completed puzzles. *(Oscar Mayer Foods Corporation)*
- An employee averted downtime on the production line thanks to the training that he received through the workplace education program. Had the employee not interceded, the cost of the downtime would have exceeded the annual operating budget for the education center. *(Woodbridge Corporation)*

IMPROVED PRODUCT QUALITY AND SERVICE

- Prior to the grant program, employees had trouble accurately completing job tickets in the machine shop. Now, those problems do not exist. *(Ariens Company)*
- The problem-solving and blueprint reading classes offered through the workplace education program have translated into improved product quality. Now, employees are able to solve problems more independently and in less time. *(Borg Indak, Inc.)*
- Through the delivery of site-specific measurement training to employees department-wide, product quality is higher. *(Colonial Craft)*
- The basic blueprint reading class offered to Design Center sales staff resulted in better customer service. Those employees are more comfortable and more confident when working with customers who bring blueprints to determine which fixtures to purchase. *(Kohler Company)*

INCREASED ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

- The workplace education program peer advisors are a self-managed team. They hold meetings, solve problems, make decisions, and deliver presentations to upper management. The peer advisor team serves as the model for the teams that are being developed company-wide. *(Ariens Company)*
- Through increased problem solving and communication skills, employees are able to address difficulties more effectively and return to work more quickly. *(Ariens Company)*

- During the grant, a cultural shift occurred within the company that will better prepare employees for anticipated technological changes. Initially, many employees questioned the investment of their time and the company's resources in the workplace education program. Now, employees are open and positive about training. *(Gehl Company)*
- Through the conduct of WESAs, a department was restructured and a form was redesigned. Both activities directly increased operating efficiency. *(Greenheck Fan Corporation)*
- There is greater awareness of how training can help meet production and personal needs. Now, employees ask for training, managers include it in their budgets, training needs are discussed during employee reviews, and employees express their appreciation for the training. *(Vollrath Company, Inc.)*

INTERNATIONAL CERTIFICATION ASSISTANCE

- The workplace education program helped the company to receive ISO 9001 certification last year and will be important to maintaining that certification, particularly as it relates to employees writing work instructions and using math skills more accurately on the job. *(Ariens Company)*
- The customized curriculum, competency-based assessments, and related training will help in terms of training and documentation as the company pursues ISO 9000 certification. *(Colonial Craft)*
- By helping employees to read better, strengthen comprehension skills, and attain greater proficiency in math, the workplace education program assisted the corporation in becoming QS 9000 certified earlier this year. *(Woodbridge Corporation)*

ENHANCED EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION

- The peer advisors and steering committee for the workplace education program coordinate company-funded "spin-off" seminars such as estate planning and hunter safety. These seminars are extremely popular with employees and make a difference in their personal and work lives. *(Ariens Company)*
- Morale has improved, particularly among employees with the greatest skill needs. Every employee who participated in the program successfully completed at least one unit of study. This success has meant a positive and observable change in attitude. *(Ariens Company)*
- The workplace education program helps to create an environment in which all employees feel equal. This environment was fostered by the mandatory assessment given to all manufacturing employees on company time; the group instruction provided on company time that brought all employees to the required levels in math, reading, and writing; and the peer advisor initiatives that involved individuals with diverse backgrounds. *(Ariens Company)*
- The individualized instruction and group classes offered through the workplace education program have helped employees attain higher-level and more fulfilling positions. *(Borg Indak, Inc.)*
- Employees are pleased that the company is offering a convenient alternative to traveling 40 to 50 minutes to pursue other educational opportunities. *(Colonial Craft)*
- Employee self-esteem and confidence in themselves and in their work has increased as a result of program participation. *(Greenheck Fan Corporation)*
- Through the one-on-one instruction it offers, the workplace education program helps employees in their personal lives from providing greater assistance to children when doing their homework, to increasing computer skills, to obtaining a GED. *(Marathon Electric Manufacturing Corporation)*
- Six employees graduated from the External Diploma Program and three individuals received a GED through the workplace education program. *(Oscar Mayer Foods Corporation)*
- The workplace education program has altered many attitudes. Now, employees look forward to training. When there is a problem on the floor, the focus is on how training can help and not on what the worker did wrong. *(Traex Division - Menasha Corporation)*

- The workplace education program offers employees who want to move into higher-paying jobs the opportunity to brush-up on skills and acquire new ones needed to pass the tests in the tool and die, distribution, and apprenticeship areas. Since this grant began, every employee who participated in the program successfully completed the probationary period required by the higher-level position. Previously, a significant number of employees did not pass the probationary period. *(Vollrath Company, Inc.)*

STRENGTHENED LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

- The joint labor-management education program breaks down barriers between front-line managers and employees, and among members of different unions. There is more cooperation and communication between management and the unions, and on the floor among employees. *(Fisher Hamilton Scientific, Inc.)*
- The joint workplace education program helps to cement management's relationship with hourly workers who receive 90% of the training offered through the program and use it quite heavily. Over the three-year grant, an average of 10% of the total workforce participated in the program. *(Kohler Company)*
- After a tough contract negotiation, the rebound was much faster as a result of the joint union and management involvement in the workplace education program. This involvement also facilitated and increased the number of other labor-management activities undertaken. *(Woodbridge Corporation)*

SELLING POINT WITH PROSPECTIVE CLIENTS AND EMPLOYEES

- The workplace education program is a selling point to prospective clients. On a tour of the facility, which includes the learning center, a soon-to-be major client asked if as a client he could receive the site-specific curriculum and related assessments for use with his employees. *(Colonial Craft)*
- The joint labor-management training program is a selling point with potential customers and employees. While most of the contracts are awarded through a prescribed bid process, the joint training program demonstrates a commitment to quality and a cooperative environment, and in some cases those intangible items have made the competitive difference. *(Fisher Hamilton Scientific, Inc.)*

COMMUNITY BENEFITS

- Individuals who are in lay-off or recall status use the workplace education program, and one of these individuals is pursuing a GED. *(Ariens Company)*
- The workplace education program is helping to prepare employees for new jobs as they face a plant closing. The hands-on computer training has enabled many individuals to shift from manufacturing jobs to office positions that they desired. *(Northeast Milwaukee Industrial Development Corporation)*

The Wisconsin Workplace Partnership Training Program is funded through a U.S. Department of Education National Workplace Literacy Program grant awarded to the Wisconsin Technical College System Board in partnership with the Wisconsin State AFL-CIO, the Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce, and the Center on Education and Work at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

This listing is based on visits to the participating worksites during September and October of 1997. At each of the site visits, the state partner representatives (Tom Grinde, Wisconsin Technical College System Board; Geoff Upperton, Wisconsin State AFL-CIO LETC; and Donna Manly, Center on Education and Work) met with employer, union, and educational stakeholders as appropriate at each location. This document is a partial listing of the benefits identified by the stakeholders at each site and was compiled by Donna Manly, Center on Education and Work, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1025 West Johnson Street, Room 964, Madison, Wisconsin 53706-1796. For more information, call (608) 263-7592.

WISCONSIN WORKPLACE PARTNERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM BENEFITS

1994 - 1997

STATE PARTNERS

WISCONSIN MANUFACTURERS & COMMERCE
James S. Haney, President

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM BOARD
Edward Chin, State Director

CENTER ON EDUCATION AND WORK
University of Wisconsin-Madison
L. Allen Phelps, Director

WISCONSIN STATE AFL-CIO
David Newby, President

LOCAL PARTNERS

ARIENS COMPANY
Fox Valley Technical College

BORG INDAK, INC.
International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, District Lodge 10
Gateway Technical College

COLONIAL CRAFT
Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College

FISHER HAMILTON SCIENTIFIC INC.
United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Local 1533
International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, Local 175
Lakeshore Technical College

GEHL COMPANY
United Paperworkers International Union, Local 7579
Moraine Park Technical College

GREENHECK FAN CORPORATION
Sheet Metal Workers International Association, Local 565
Northcentral Technical College

KOHLER COMPANY
United Auto Workers, Local 833
Lakeshore Technical College

MARATHON ELECTRIC MANUFACTURING CORPORATION
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 1791 Teamsters International
Northcentral Technical College

NORTHEAST MILWAUKEE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, Local 66
Milwaukee Area Technical College

OSCAR MAYER FOODS CORPORATION
United Food and Commercial Workers International Union, Local 538
Madison Area Technical College

TRAEX DIVISION - MENASHA CORPORATION
Madison Area Technical College

VOLLRATH COMPANY, INC.
United Auto Workers, Local 1472
Aluminum, Brick and Glass Workers International, Local 175
Lakeshore Technical College

WOODBRIDGE CORPORATION
Union of Needletrades, Industrial and Textile Employees, Local 1871
Blackhawk Technical College

WISCONSIN WORKPLACE PARTNERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM BENEFITS

Of the 13 worksites currently involved in the 1994-1997 Wisconsin Workplace Partnership Training Program, 11 sites plan to continue their workplace education programs after the grant funding ends. The majority of these sites are budgeting their post-grant programs at the current combined grant and private sector funding level or higher. This is perhaps the greatest testimony to the value of the Wisconsin Workplace Partnership Training Program. It is also significant to note that the remaining two sites will continue to provide training, but the format and the extent of the training is unknown at this time. A partial listing of the program benefits that partners at participating worksites reported is provided below.

BOTTOM-LINE SAVINGS

- Employees view the workplace education program as a benefit which helps to keep the turnover rate lower than the industry average and in turn means a bottom-line savings. *(Colonial Craft)*
- Every employee in the east plant was required to complete a 4½-hour hands-on course in measurement and gauging. As a result of the training, measuring accuracy improved company-wide and a reduction in rework produced documented savings. *(Gehl Company)*
- While employees receive worker's compensation, they participate in the workplace education program which brings them back to work sooner and saves the company money. *(Greenheck Fan Corporation)*
- By revamping the employee orientation program to include training identified through Workplace Educational Skills Analyses (WESAs), the overall training time for new employees is substantially less and the recruits are more productive earlier. A new facility in another state implemented this model and it resulted in a much faster start-up. *(Greenheck Fan Corporation)*
- The safety incidents are lower as a direct result of the workplace education program. Instructors provide safety information at monthly meetings, create crossword puzzles based on new safety terms, and coordinate monthly prize drawings from the completed puzzles. *(Oscar Mayer Foods Corporation)*
- An employee averted downtime on the production line thanks to the training that he received through the workplace education program. Had the employee not interceded, the cost of the downtime would have exceeded the annual operating budget for the education center. *(Woodbridge Corporation)*

IMPROVED PRODUCT QUALITY AND SERVICE

- Prior to the grant program, employees had trouble accurately completing job tickets in the machine shop. Now, those problems do not exist. *(Ariens Company)*
- The problem solving and blueprint reading classes offered through the workplace education program have translated into improved product quality. Now, employees are able to solve problems more independently and in less time. *(Borg Indak, Inc.)*
- Through the delivery of site-specific measurement training to employees department-wide, product quality is higher. *(Colonial Craft)*
- The basic blueprint reading class offered to Design Center sales staff resulted in better customer service. Those employees are more comfortable and more confident when working with customers who bring blueprints to determine which fixtures to purchase. *(Kohler Company)*

INCREASED ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

- The workplace education program peer advisors are a self-managed team. They hold meetings, solve problems, make decisions, and deliver presentations to upper management. The peer advisor team serves as the model for the teams that are being developed company-wide. *(Ariens Company)*
- Through increased problem solving and communication skills, employees are able to address difficulties more effectively and return to work more quickly. *(Ariens Company)*

- During the grant, a cultural shift occurred within the company that will better prepare employees for anticipated technological changes. Initially, many employees questioned the investment of their time and the company's resources in the workplace education program. Now, employees are open and positive about training. *(Gehl Company)*
- Through the conduct of WESAs, a department was restructured and a form was redesigned. Both activities directly increased operating efficiency. *(Greenheck Fan Corporation)*
- There is greater awareness of how training can help meet production and personal needs. Now, employees ask for training, managers include it in their budgets, training needs are discussed during employee reviews, and employees express their appreciation for the training. *(Vollrath Company, Inc.)*

INTERNATIONAL CERTIFICATION ASSISTANCE

- The workplace education program helped the company to receive ISO 9001 certification last year and will be important to maintaining that certification, particularly as it relates to employees writing work instructions and using math skills more accurately on the job. *(Ariens Company)*
- The customized curriculum, competency-based assessments, and related training will help in terms of training and documentation as the company pursues ISO 9000 certification. *(Colonial Craft)*
- By helping employees to read better, strengthen comprehension skills, and attain greater proficiency in math, the workplace education program assisted the corporation in becoming QS 9000 certified earlier this year. *(Woodbridge Corporation)*

ENHANCED EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION

- The peer advisors and steering committee for the workplace education program coordinate company-funded "spin-off" seminars such as estate planning and hunter safety. These seminars are extremely popular with employees and make a difference in their personal and work lives. *(Ariens Company)*
- Morale has improved, particularly among employees with the greatest skill needs. Every employee who participated in the program successfully completed at least one unit of study. This success has meant a positive and observable change in attitude. *(Ariens Company)*
- The workplace education program helps to create an environment in which all employees feel equal. This environment was fostered by the mandatory assessment given to all manufacturing employees on company time; the group instruction provided on company time that brought all employees to the required levels in math, reading, and writing; and the peer advisor initiatives that involved individuals with diverse backgrounds. *(Ariens Company)*
- The individualized instruction and group classes offered through the workplace education program have helped employees attain higher-level and more fulfilling positions. *(Borg Indak, Inc.)*
- Employees are pleased that the company is offering a convenient alternative to traveling 40 to 50 minutes to pursue other educational opportunities. *(Colonial Craft)*
- Employee self-esteem and confidence in themselves and in their work has increased as a result of program participation. *(Greenheck Fan Corporation)*
- Through the one-on-one instruction it offers, the workplace education program helps employees in their personal lives from providing greater assistance to children when doing their homework, to increasing computer skills, to obtaining a GED. *(Marathon Electric Manufacturing Corporation)*
- Six employees graduated from the External Diploma Program and three individuals received a GED through the workplace education program. *(Oscar Mayer Foods Corporation)*
- The workplace education program has altered many attitudes. Now, employees look forward to training. When there is a problem on the floor, the focus is on how training can help and not on what the worker did wrong. *(Traex Division - Menasha Corporation)*

- The workplace education program offers employees who want to move into higher-paying jobs the opportunity to brush-up on skills and acquire new ones needed to pass the tests in the tool and die, distribution, and apprenticeship areas. Since this grant began, every employee who participated in the program successfully completed the probationary period required by the higher-level position. Previously, a significant number of employees did not pass the probationary period. *(Vollrath Company, Inc.)*

STRENGTHENED LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

- The joint labor-management education program breaks down barriers between front-line managers and employees, and among members of different unions. There is more cooperation and communication between management and the unions, and on the floor among employees. *(Fisher Hamilton Scientific, Inc.)*
- The joint workplace education program helps to cement management's relationship with hourly workers who receive 90% of the training offered through the program and use it quite heavily. Over the three-year grant, an average of 10% of the total workforce participated in the program. *(Kohler Company)*
- After a tough contract negotiation, the rebound was much faster as a result of the joint union and management involvement in the workplace education program. This involvement also facilitated and increased the number of other labor-management activities undertaken. *(Woodbridge Corporation)*

SELLING POINT WITH PROSPECTIVE CLIENTS AND EMPLOYEES

- The workplace education program is a selling point to prospective clients. On a tour of the facility, which includes the learning center, a soon-to-be major client asked if as a client he could receive the site-specific curriculum and related assessments for use with his employees. *(Colonial Craft)*
- The joint labor-management training program is a selling point with potential customers and employees. While most of the contracts are awarded through a prescribed bid process, the joint training program demonstrates a commitment to quality and a cooperative environment, and in some cases those intangible items have made the competitive difference. *(Fisher Hamilton Scientific, Inc.)*

COMMUNITY BENEFITS

- Individuals who are in lay-off or recall status use the workplace education program, and one of these individuals is pursuing a GED. *(Ariens Company)*
- The workplace education program is helping to prepare employees for new jobs as they face a plant closing. The hands-on computer training has enabled many individuals to shift from manufacturing jobs to office positions that they desired. *(Northeast Milwaukee Industrial Development Corporation)*

The Wisconsin Workplace Partnership Training Program is funded through a U.S. Department of Education National Workplace Literacy Program grant awarded to the Wisconsin Technical College System Board in partnership with the Wisconsin State AFL-CIO, the Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce, and the Center on Education and Work at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

This listing is based on visits to the participating worksites during September and October of 1997. At each of the site visits, the state partner representatives (Tom Grinde, Wisconsin Technical College System Board; Geoff Upperton, Wisconsin State AFL-CIO LETC; and Donna Manly, Center on Education and Work) met with employer, union, and educational stakeholders as appropriate at each location. This document is a partial listing of the benefits identified by the stakeholders at each site and was compiled by Donna Manly, Center on Education and Work, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1025 West Johnson Street, Room 964, Madison, Wisconsin 53706-1796. For more information, call (608) 263-7592.

APPENDIX B

Structured Interview Forms

COLLEGE NAME
Interview Guide for Partners
Date

1. Place of employment _____

2. How satisfied are you with the project? Why?

3. How effective was the partnership between industry and the College?

4. Did your expectations change during the course of the project? How?

5. What were your major disappointments?

6. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.)? Examples?

7. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?

8. How cost-effective was the project?

9. How do you feel about continuing the project?

10. Has the project helped the company with public relations (newspaper articles, TV, or radio coverage, etc.)? Examples?

11. Has the project improved the company's training program? Examples?

12. What changes do you see in the near future that would change the needs of your workers for training?

13. Would you recommend this training program to your colleagues in other companies?

14. Other comments:

College Name
Supervisor/Training Director Interview Guide
Date

1. Place of Employment: _____
2. Name of Class: _____
3. Number of your workers who participated: _____
4. How satisfied were you with the class(es)? Why?

5. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.)? Examples?

6. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?

7. Has participation in the class(es) affected their chances for advancement?

8. How much did the workers talk to you about the class(es)?

9. How did the workers who participated feel about the class(es)?

10. How did the other workers feel about the class(es)?

11. How did you feel about releasing workers from the job? How did you accommodate?

12. How does this training compare with training the company has done or could do itself?

13. Would you recommend the company continue this kind of training?

14. What are the advantages and disadvantages of working with the College in offering the class(es)?

15. Other comments:

COLLEGE NAME
Learner Interview Guide
Date

1. Place of Employment: _____
2. Name of Class: _____
3. How satisfied were you with the class? Why?

4. What was the most important part? Least important?

5. What did you gain from the class?

6. How did the class help you with your job? Examples?

   Reading?

   Writing?

   Speaking?

   Listening?

   Math?

   Teamwork?
7. Did the class help you understand the company better? Examples?

8. Do you feel better about yourself as a worker as a result of the class?

9. Did the class prepare you for a company training program? Which one?

10. Did the class help you with getting a promotion or a better job? How?

11. How did your fellow workers feel about you taking the class?

12. Would you recommend others to take the class?

13. Did you get support from your supervisor to attend the class?

14. Do you look forward to any more classes? Where?

15. Do you do any more reading, writing, or math at work than you did before the class? Examples?

16. Do you do any more reading, writing, or math at home than you did before the class? Examples?

17. How did the class help you outside the job? Examples?

    Family?

    Community?

    Voting?

18. Other comments:

COLLEGE NAME
Staff Interview Guide
Date

1. How satisfied are you with the project?

2. What are the greatest satisfactions?

3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?

4. What factors helped with the success of the project?

5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?

6. What do you see as the major outcomes?

7. What are the major disappointments?

8. What was the most difficult part of the project?

9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?

10. What would you change in a future project?

11. How has the college benefited from the project?

12. How much support have you had from the college?

13. How cost-effective was the project?

14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?

15. Other comments:

APPENDIX C

Interview Data

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Partners Interview Guide

Name:
Organization Name:
Position:
Date of interview:
Visit Number:

1. How satisfied were you with the project? Why?	
2. How effective was the partnership between industry and the College?	
3. Did your expectations change during the course of the project? How?	
4. What were your major disappointments?	
5. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	
6. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	
7. How cost-effective was the program?	
8. How do you feel about continuing the project?	
9. Has the project helped the company with public relations (newspaper articles, TV, radio coverage, etc.)?	
10. What changes do you see in the future that would change the needs of your workers for training?	

11. Has this project improved the company's training program? Examples?	
12. Would you recommend this training program to your colleagues in other companies?	
13. Other comments:	

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Partners Interview Guide

Name: Union Project Representative
Organization Name: AFL-CIO Union
Position:
Date of interview: May 30-June 2, 1995
Visit Number: 1

1. How satisfied were you with the project? Why?	Good. Three companies dropped the program because of delays in funding or because of rapidly changing company circumstances or personnel. This is frustrating.
2. How effective was the partnership between industry and the College?	Very, even in non-union sites.
3. Did your expectations change during the course of the project? How?	Would like to evaluate technical training—more flexibility.
4. What were your major disappointments?	(not answered)
5. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	Better adjustment to change. Improved management-labor relations. Usually sit down to discuss grievances—not here. Win-win situation.
6. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	Respondent wants to take this educational model to the rest of the state.
7. How cost-effective was the program?	(Remainder of questions not answered)
8. How do you feel about continuing the project?	
9. Has the project helped the company with public relations (newspaper articles, TV, radio coverage, etc.)?	
10. What changes do you see in the future that would change the needs of your workers for training?	

11. Has this project improved the company's training program? Examples?	
12. Would you recommend this training program to your colleagues in other companies?	
13. Other comments:	

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Partners Interview Guide

Name: HR Representative (Company 1)
Organization Name: Company 1
Position: Human Resources
Date of interview: May 30-June 2, 1995
Visit Number: 1

1. How satisfied were you with the project? Why?	I am satisfied with the project. We have been able to provide services to about 17% of the hourly workforce in about 7 months. I expect this percentage to grow over the next 2 years.
2. How effective was the partnership between industry and the College?	Very effective. It provided a great resource for our center and the people we have worked with have done a good job.
3. Did your expectations change during the course of the project? How?	My expectations changed in regards to how the delivery of services would take place. I envisioned a "classroom" type setting for teaching. However, our employee population prefers "one-on-one" instruction so this is how we approach it.
4. What were your major disappointments?	I don't feel the steering committee (myself included) have done a good enough job marketing the center. I'm hopeful with our new vision, this will change.
5. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	Productivity and fewer counting errors.
6. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	Self esteem/self-confidence.
7. How cost-effective was the program?	Year one was very cost-effective.
8. How do you feel about continuing the project?	Very positive.
9. Has the project helped the company with public relations (newspaper articles, TV, radio coverage, etc.)?	Yes, throughout our corporation it has.

10. What changes do you see in the future that would change the needs of your workers for training?	Work cell implementation, quality audits performed by press operators.
11. Has this project improved the company's training program? Examples?	I believe it has added to and enhanced what we offer. The project is in alignment with our Excellence Process.
12. Would you recommend this training program to your colleagues in other companies?	Yes, if the process was streamlined (paperwork) and funds could go beyond basic skills.
13. Other comments:	Too much paperwork required of instructor. Try to streamline the paper chain. Stretch the boundaries beyond basic skills (in other words, "get out of the box").

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Partners Interview Guide

Name: University Evaluator
Organization Name: University of Wisconsin Center for Workforce Education
Position:
Date of interview: May 30-June 2, 1995
Visit Number: 1

1. How satisfied were you with the project? Why?	Fairly satisfied. Good job of building on existing resources of previous projects and national projects. Networking important—new instructors learn from others.
2. How effective was the partnership between industry and the College?	The partnership with the state is getting better. Two educational partners plus manufacturing association and AFL-CIO. Learned from each other. The colleges have some experienced educators who can bring together labor and management.
3. Did your expectations change during the course of the project? How?	No.
4. What were your major disappointments?	More sites for WESA and checklists—but it takes a long time to do new things.
5. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	Needs assessment of all workers led to group instructional areas and communities. They share samples and self-report, not test. They can identify where to begin WESAs. Good participation.
6. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	Labor-management relations improved. Peer advisors take reluctant workers to center. They know about the different courses and tell the workers how the learning center can help them. They help out in the class with the technical content.
7. How cost-effective was the program?	It is cost-effective because it uses existing resources. Group instruction is more cost-efficient.
8. How do you feel about continuing the project?	Institutions are good at individual sites—and they always try to improve. Statewide, NWLP will hold together the project, and block grants will improve local service delivery.

9. Has the project helped the company with public relations (newspaper articles, TV, radio coverage, etc.)?	Some sites lack PR expertise. Next fall—major media blitz (gave local sites templates).
10. What changes do you see in the future that would change the needs of your workers for training?	(not answered)
11. Has this project improved the company's training program? Examples?	Yes, where there are already existing training programs.
12. Would you recommend this training program to your colleagues in other companies?	(not answered)
13. Other comments:	(not answered)

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Partners Interview Guide

Name: Union Project Representative, Union Representative
Organization Name: AFL-CIO Union
Position: Union representatives to unionized sites served by Blackhawk and MATC
Date of interview: February 6-8, 1996
Visit Number: 2

1. How satisfied were you with the project? Why?	Very—it answers the needs of workers. It takes time.
2. How effective was the partnership between industry and the College?	Stronger than it used to be. People are now understanding the importance of the program. The pushing has come from labor. Union Representative is recruiting new sites and evaluating non-union sites.
3. Did your expectations change during the course of the project? How?	Union Project Representative trains peer advisors—even non-union companies are ok about this. Success through partnership—information sharing through state meetings. Includes non-federal participation. Good influence on school-to-work, HPWO, etc. The crucial part is getting workers over their fear. The key is continuous improvement—the skills needed to be flexible.
4. What were your major disappointments?	When a company drops out of the program (Reynolds dropped out because they thought they could dictate the curriculum). Cannot use program for other than basic skills. Would like more flexibility.
5. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	The company is in the process of becoming QS 9000 compliant. Al, the plant manager, and the union president will work together to get the company in the program. Standards in the automotive industry are going up, as is quality. Education necessary to an auto supplier—employees have to be able to react quickly, meeting needs of Ford, GM, Chrysler now.
6. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	Program makes them trainable. Management thinks employee attitude is important. Assembly line production is boring—workers need other stimulation. Cross-training for promotion and flexibility.
7. How cost-effective was the program?	Very—get high quality opportunity to upgrade skills in convenient location. All win. Instructor onsite and responsive to individual needs—also is a counselor and liaison to the college and further training.

8. How do you feel about continuing the project?	Will continue if labor is involved. Basic education is a cornerstone of HPWO—AFL-CIO in partnership with management. Will continue on regional basis but may become fragmented—need state partnership and leadership—will try to keep federal money.
9. Has the project helped the company with public relations (newspaper articles, TV, radio coverage, etc.)?	Yes—public relations—advertise in plants and outside.
10. What changes do you see in the future that would change the needs of your workers for training?	HPWO, subcontract only—no state AFL-CIO money—depends on grants only.
11. Has this project improved the company's training program? Examples?	Makes workers trainable and able to benefit from training. Broadened training abilities—metric conversion led to a multi-million dollar contract.
12. Would you recommend this training program to your colleagues in other companies?	Yes, this is part of their job. They talk about it at labor councils, conferences, etc.
13. Other comments:	One company was frustrated by serving only a few students—they wanted classes. (the Boyd Co.)

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Partners Interview Guide

Name: Company 2 Plant Manager
Organization Name: Company 2
Position: Plant Manager
Date of interview: February 6-8, 1996
Visit Number: 2

1. How satisfied were you with the project? Why?	Very. Workers are eager—leads to activity. Offering large number of basic skills. Good utility.
2. How effective was the partnership between industry and the College?	Good. They followed through. Good orientation for workers.
3. Did your expectations change during the course of the project? How?	Has wanted a program like this for some time. It is fulfilling expectations. Peer advisors represent a cross-section of the plant. They have done well—have recruited workers.
4. What were your major disappointments?	None. It's gone on just as the SC has planned.
5. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	Workers are ready for additional responsibilities and they are more trainable. 30 day job training for new job.
6. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	Job content is changing. This training makes them eligible for future jobs. Slow change. Total employee numbers are down due to technology upgrades and attrition.
7. How cost-effective was the program?	Can't prove that it was, but his gut feeling is yes.
8. How do you feel about continuing the project?	Haven't thought about it. Intends to, yes.
9. Has the project helped the company with public relations (newspaper articles, TV, radio coverage, etc.)?	Employees view it positively. Not advertised in the company.
10. What changes do you see in the future that would change the needs of your workers for training?	More technical skills—PC interface on machines. About 60% of workers are unskilled—there will be less unskilled jobs in future.

11. Has this project improved the company's training program? Examples?	It's premature to answer this. Center just opened in September.
12. Would you recommend this training program to your colleagues in other companies?	Hasn't recommended it so far, but would.
13. Other comments:	Instructors are good. Blackhawk TC is great. Good relationshop with union—union told him about the program.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Partners Interview Guide

Name:
Organization Name: Company 3, served by Lakeshore Technical College
Position: Human Resources
Date of interview: April 29-30, 1996
Visit Number: 3

1. How satisfied were you with the project? Why?	We are pretty satisfied. Our employees have been slow to participate in these programs. Part of the problem is that they have to do this off work time. Many are unwilling to stay after hours to take these types of classes.
2. How effective was the partnership between industry and the College?	We have always had a good working relationship with LTC and have used them for several applications outside of the workplace grant.
3. Did your expectations change during the course of the project? How?	Yes. When we entered the project, I was very unclear as to what the grant would actually mean for our company. As we moved through the project, I developed a better understanding of what our benefit would be under this project.
4. What were your major disappointments?	We have been disappointed in our employees' unwillingness to recognize a basic skills need. Many of our employees are very comfortable in their positions in the company and do not have a sense of "urgency".
5. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	Through the blueprint reading courses we have seen an increase in productivity within certain departments. This class has also prompted certain individuals to pursue additional classes and education tracks.
6. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	Hard to measure, but many employees have expressed their gratitude to the company for providing basic skills courses.
7. How cost-effective was the program?	The grant money was helpful in starting various programs at our company. We were able to provide tapes/videos for our remote locations/employees and also offer the basic skills classes that were helpful for those who took advantage of these classes.
8. How do you feel about continuing the project?	Our company will continue a training initiative after the grant is completed. However, as in most companies, budgets for training depend on the overall success of the company in any given year.

9. Has the project helped the company with public relations (newspaper articles, TV, radio coverage, etc.)?	No
10. What changes do you see in the future that would change the needs of your workers for training?	ISO 9001 certification, continued investment in Robotics equipment
11. Has this project improved the company's training program? Examples?	Yes, this program was the "kickstart" we needed to begin a training program at our company.
12. Would you recommend this training program to your colleagues in other companies?	Yes
13. Other comments:	(not answered)

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Partners Interview Guide

Name: Management Rep., Union Rep.
Organization Name: Company 4, served by Moraine Park
Position:
Date of interview: April 29-30, 1996
Visit Number: 3

1. How satisfied were you with the project? Why?	87 out of 220 shop employees volunteer 1-2 hours per week for classes. Blueprint for welders is held on the clock (in-house class).
2. How effective was the partnership between industry and the College?	WESA done before learning center—all peer advisors, room built. Excellent—had voice in hiring instructor.
3. Did your expectations change during the course of the project? How?	Confidentiality not a problem—students were proud of having their picture in the paper. They feel proud of the learning center. $50 reward for completing course—10 hours on average.
4. What were your major disappointments?	(not answered)
5. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	Stabilize workforce—but little turnover except for a few years ago. CNC machines—with older workforce. Hard to measure.
6. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	Employees using center—boss placed in annual report. Buy-in at top level. Anecdotal evidence—morale leads to retention. A lot less complaining.
7. How cost-effective was the program?	Morale good—can't say how many stayed because of learning center. Peer advisors operate on own time. Not much money—built room, buying new computers. Curriculum expert onsite—developed blueprint reading courses taught by workers—measuring taught by workers in learning center.
8. How do you feel about continuing the project?	Plan is to continue learning center and relationship with college.
9. Has the project helped the company with public relations (newspaper articles, TV, radio coverage, etc.)?	Publicity—newspapers, company newsletter, learning center newsletter, stockholder report.

10. What changes do you see in the future that would change the needs of your workers for training?	CNC Older workforce—gradual turnoverleading to replacements. Down to minimum number workforce.
11. Has this project improved the company's training program? Examples?	Enhanced—had been doing only bare necessity.
12. Would you recommend this training program to your colleagues in other companies?	Yes, done.
13. Other comments:	Good support from state union people—Union Project Representative. Farm implement business slow—but have variety of products. Working with plants in SD and PA. Use room for other training—SC makes decisions—as many decisions as possible left to peer advisors' coordination. Designed flag, wrote mission statement, logo, note pads, PR.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Partners Interview Guide

Name: Company Representative
Organization Name: Company 4, Company 5, Company 6
Position:
Date of interview: April 29-30, 1996
Visit Number: 3

1. How satisfied were you with the project? Why?	When workers are hired, they have to pass assessment in learning center before hired on dock. Otherwise, voluntary participation.
2. How effective was the partnership between industry and the College?	Good.
3. Did your expectations change during the course of the project? How?	No, but awareness has.
4. What were your major disappointments?	Company 6—key HR person left. Too much time before implementation.
5. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	Teacher needs to document anecdotes. GED completion. Apprenticeship program requires exams for basic skills—also better positions—good test scores required. A number of employees are asking for promotions.
6. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	Self-esteem, morale. Managers also use learning center. New employee training—reduced learning curve from 3 months to 1 month. WESA identified need for applied math—led to more instruction. Turnover in bottom jobs—led to better criteria and tests for hiring. Company 6 following Company 4—better orientation. Company 5 started it.
7. How cost-effective was the program?	Decrease in workmen's compensation. Go to learning center on clock. Significant decrease in number of days out—time in learning center leads to getting back to work faster. Decrease in learning curve for new employees by 2/3. More accurate at bottom job—also change in attitude.
8. How do you feel about continuing the project?	Company 5 has institutionalized it. Company 4—no question they will continue. Will continue with college and hire an instructor later. Company 6 is expanding it to their plant in TN.

9. Has the project helped the company with public relations (newspaper articles, TV, radio coverage, etc.)?	Company 4—interviewed by TV. No problem with confidentiality.
10. What changes do you see in the future that would change the needs of your workers for training?	Computers—machines in future—new equipment. Higher math skills. Troubleshooting, basic programming knowledge.
11. Has this project improved the company's training program? Examples?	Yes—learning center is used to prep for entrance exams.
12. Would you recommend this training program to your colleagues in other companies?	Interested in setting up plant in KY. Union rep telling other companies.
13. Other comments:	Computers in learning center and individual help—PLATO and other software. Company 6 has Modumath plus paper. Company 4 opened learning center before grant. WESA process—on jobs where production needs. ESL and pre-employment training—not funded by grant—led to ESL on site. Commitment to help Asian immigrants (23% of school population). Company 4—young workforce, low turnover. WESA led to better hiring now. Company 6—older workers—40s. Company 5 also has older workers and low turnover.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Partners Interview Guide

Name: University Evaluators
Organization Name: UW Center for Employment and Work
Position:
Date of interview: September 3-5, 1996
Visit Number: 4

1. How satisfied were you with the project? Why?	University Evaluator 2—statewide partners' meetings good. University Evaluator 1—full time—developed WESA technology, site visits, TA, curriculum development, materials development—good inservice training for WESA. Analysis for graduate credit. Difficult because CAVE gone but need to train managers and instructors. Betty Hayes move to Educational Administration with technical college postsecondary.
2. How effective was the partnership between industry and the College?	Worked well—handled by University Evaluator 1. Identified on-going responses for peer advisors. Needs to change with changing program and need.
3. Did your expectations change during the course of the project? How?	Getting completed WESAs for September statewide meeting led to deletion of proprietary information. Got work in print. Goal—to expedite WESA (212 completions) and provide templates.
4. What were your major disappointments?	Not high on State Director of Vocational Education's agenda---others good. Technical college plays a vita role—relationship with UW Ext. ABE doesn't like workforce education—feels it is taking away money.
5. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	(not answered)
6. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	(not answered)
7. How cost-effective was the program?	External TA necessary for first couple of years—CEW collecting best practices. Need external funding. Companies to integrate program with their goals.

8. How do you feel about continuing the project?	Will sustain publications, conferences, pre and post workshops, TA.
9. Has the project helped the company with public relations (newspaper articles, TV, radio coverage, etc.)?	(not answered)
10. What changes do you see in the future that would change the needs of your workers for training?	Do other projects—leading to R & D especially in workforce preparation. School to work. Products purchased by k-12.
11. Has this project improved the company's training program? Examples?	Modified technical training due to WESA information. How basic skills fits in with ISO 9000 and technical training.
12. Would you recommend this training program to your colleagues in other companies?	(not answered)
13. Other comments:	Reinforce adult education to Dean and School of Education. Project raises issues. How to tie together all efforts with greater involvement and influence. Current CEW effort—how to use WESA information in assessment and curriculum development at colleges. Work-related instructor uses WESA—work site materials and terminology being used in generic instruction. Vocabulary lists for ESL. Many teachers don't know how to do curriculum development—need training.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Partners Interview Guide

Name:
Organization Name: Company 2
Position: Plant manager, human resources person, union representative, college instructors
Date of interview: September 3-5, 1996
Visit Number: 4

1. How satisfied were you with the project? Why?	Yes—management likes the voluntary nature—some training is on the clock.
2. How effective was the partnership between industry and the College?	Very—each partner has contributed. Students earn fake money—use it for casino night.
3. Did your expectations change during the course of the project? How?	Management pleasantly surprised. Sees new uses—computer skills for new hires. Instructor helps them learn technology/computer skills. Computers are the incentive for students to attend the center. "Bait and switch." Not teaching programs, teaching critical thinking and problem solving and learning programs. Accomplished so much in a little time because the steering committee members work between meetings—they are committed.
4. What were your major disappointments?	Wants goals to be reached faster—no real disappointments. Came in later in the grant cycle—began Fall of 1995.
5. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	Daily workers ask for help re terminology and computer skills. Anecdotes—skills upgrading has led to promotions. Won top award for safety in company-4 years. Can't quantify results but all going in the right direction. QS 9000 registration qualifications—this year no negative comments about communications on the floor. Educational program will keep them on the cutting edge.
6. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	Parents need to learn computers so they can help kids. Self esteem improved. Different parts of the plant work together—et to know each other in the center. Builds team work.

7. How cost-effective was the program?	If they had to stop production, _ hour of down time would pay for a year's program. High speed manufacturing. Harder to identify impact of program. Could apply for more money—company provided match. Pareto software was under utilized—need basic computer skills to be able to run.
8. How do you feel about continuing the project?	Grant helped put learning center in place—plan to continue.
9. Has the project helped the company with public relations (newspaper articles, TV, radio coverage, etc.)?	Publicity from management and HR. Seen as benefit. Union makes presentations to others.
10. What changes do you see in the future that would change the needs of your workers for training?	More automation/robots. Looking at local area networks—revamping new software. More "knowledge workers"—fewer people touching product. Trend away from manual labor—need fewer and better qualified people (technical workforce growing).
11. Has this project improved the company's training program? Examples?	Helps monthly safety training—also other training. Improved completion of written materials (forms, job safety, etc.) Able to read quality alerts (QS 9000).
12. Would you recommend this training program to your colleagues in other companies?	Yes—has been featured in newsletter.
13. Other comments:	Peer advisors kept center open when instructors not present. (3rd shift). Do learning contract with instructor—use computers. 5-6 people come in regularly. Leave work in mailbox. Also come in to see instructor—instructor comes in at night occasionally to leave material for students.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Partners Interview Guide

Name: Union Project Representative and Union Representative
Organization Name: AFL-CIO
Position:
Date of interview: September 2-4, 1997
Visit Number: 5

1. How satisfied were you with the project? Why?	Good—sorry to see it ending. Would like to be bigger and more flexible (due to grant guidelines). Computers should not be excluded. Can do on large scale—learning from each other leads to communication through the union and network.
2. How effective was the partnership between industry and the College?	Seed money possible—breaks ice—selling an unknown. Partnerships essential—most of the time company dictates unless there is a strong partnership and union—partnership will continue if union promotes.
3. Did your expectations change during the course of the project? How?	Some companies haven't seen the full possibilities for centers. Work with educational partner to exploit opportunities. Don't realize need to integrate personal development centers and regular training—incorporate it into training plan.
4. What were your major disappointments?	Difficult for training directors to see flexible use of center—to be integrated with training. Inflexibility of the grant—can't teach computer skills. Hard to keep peer advisors in the loop—company doesn't use them.
5. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	Communications—bitter strike—the center was the only thing they would talk about. Leadership in steering committee. Unions talking to labor. Try to focus on company needs for training—start looking at individual needs—leads to humanization of workplace.
6. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	Communications, at home, self-esteem, confidence. Become active in workplace and community. Others see that happening—helps with recruiting.
7. How cost-effective was the program?	Very—especially in large companies. Touches lots of people that wouldn't otherwise. Don't have to leave workplace. Difficulty with swing shifts.

8. How do you feel about continuing the project?	Do more work with technical colleges—support labor in working with sites—leads to growth. Projects will have to be pushed from the bottom up—trust issues. Otherwise will be perceived as company training program. Can talk to local union—they decide what is needed. Help workers and union network through regular meetings on own time.
9. Has the project helped the company with public relations (newspaper articles, TV, radio coverage, etc.)?	Yes—been able to help locals—positive image. Good image with employers—management accepts—from positive role as helpers. Tries to help steering committee find middle ground on issues.
10. What changes do you see in the future that would change the needs of your workers for training?	Unions need to prioritize technology. Future of union rests on partnership. Job security from personal development and training. Local unions need to be part of partnership—to be done by state organization. Need to educate local union leadership.
11. Has this project improved the company's training program? Examples?	Humanizes—because of involvement of educators. Training becomes more effective because workers understand pre-technical skills. Instructors have helped develop training—train the trainer programs. More sources for training udeas than just Training Director—surveys.
12. Would you recommend this training program to your colleagues in other companies?	Yes—need to educate local union leadership.
13. Other comments:	Union at Company 8 did surveys of supervisors and union stewards—company could see discrepancies. Most sites—management controls and doesn't ask workers what they want. Work with non-unionized companies as well as unionized. Can be more objective focused in workforce development "the voice of reason"

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Partners Interview Guide

Name: University Evaluator
Organization Name: UW Center on Education and Work
Position:
Date of interview: September 2-4, 1997
Visit Number: 5

1. How satisfied were you with the project? Why?	Extremely good—shame it's ending—concerned what will happen. Federal program was needed for state program. Benefited from national network.
2. How effective was the partnership between industry and the College?	Very effective. Right partners. Could be more Technical college-UW linkage. Will grow—wants to build on partnership.
3. Did your expectations change during the course of the project? How?	Changed when NWLP was killed—just when given long-term opportunity. As a result, network and sharing didn't take place except at conferences.
4. What were your major disappointments?	NWLP funding ended—other partnerships, curriculum development, assessment, etc. could learn from this program. For instance, School to work could learn from NWLP and economic development.
5. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	All companies have benefited, even if they left the grant, they have continued their own (Company 5). Design and evaluate checklist helps sites upfront—they think about how they will define success at the end. Program can help with QS 9000, etc. certification and re-certification.
6. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	Promotions, personal benefits, job retention, overall working climate.
7. How cost-effective was the program?	More so at some sites—overall, products and sharing.
8. How do you feel about continuing the project?	3-year time period right—too bad it won't be able to continue its functions. Could be improved and strengthened—federal program provided money for research, professional resources, development, networking. Needs to be provided at state level.
9. Has the project helped the company with public relations (newspaper articles, TV, radio coverage, etc.)?	Some sites have done a good job—need technical assistance with how to use media. Center has gotten visibility though conferences and media.

10. What changes do you see in the future that would change the needs of your workers for training?	More service jobs—need to look at on state level. Welfare to work—should be more linkage between educational organizations and social services, dislocated workers, government organizations, etc.
11. Has this project improved the company's training program? Examples?	Yes—some small companies now develop training programs and integrate centers into training activities. HR becoming more strategic—how to integrate into company's objectives—programs have led that way
12. Would you recommend this training program to your colleagues in other companies?	Yes—runs national conference for NWLP—now independent.
13. Other comments:	Role: Effective Activities (1 each year)—compile and analyze best practices. Professional development at state meetings--training programs for WESA. Computerized WESA on word processing software (stand alone). Disseminate national workforce learning publications. Will be doing 4th Effective Activities summary of three interim reports—more professional looking.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Partners Interview Guide

Name: Project Director
Organization Name: Wisconsin Technical College System Board
Position:
Date of interview: September 2-4, 1997
Visit Number: 5

1. How satisfied were you with the project? Why?	Overall, quite satisfied. First time for three year project—companies stuck to agreement. Gave time to do something.
2. How effective was the partnership between industry and the College?	Extremely effective—educational folks out in the industries. Colleges need to be responsive.
3. Did your expectations change during the course of the project? How?	Expected more as it went along—did better than expected.
4. What were your major disappointments?	When companies drop out—one company sold, management turnover, etc. Lag time between grant proposal and funding—management might change. Support from Congress for workplace education—business not lobbying. Feds should have set up rigorous evaluation earlier.
5. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	Listen to management—hear how selling program to other companies. Lack "proof" but notice workers' confidence, etc. Better workforce—no other workers available.
6. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	Feel more secure, confident, etc. Sometimes center is available for spouses.
7. How cost-effective was the program?	Difficult to answer—is it worth it to help a few people? Respondent thinks so. Yes, if company picks up the program.
8. How do you feel about continuing the project?	Will continue through state grants. More interest in companies than expected. About 40% continued on own after federal and state grants.
9. Has the project helped the company with public relations (newspaper articles, TV, radio coverage, etc.)?	Government has visited a site—publicity. Local coverage of projects—mostly at beginning.

10. What changes do you see in the future that would change the needs of your workers for training?	Need more training because the world is changing. Need combination of basic skills and technical skills—big reason for companies to take project over.
11. Has this project improved the company's training program? Examples?	Heard from College coordinators—yes. Some companies don't have training program. Company 1—good example.
12. Would you recommend this training program to your colleagues in other companies?	Definitely.
13. Other comments:	Now changing the process—do WESA upfront—then deliver instruction for a year. 2 year state grants (75 and 50%) funding Buy-in to evaluation system in most places. Milwaukee—ideal site-great help in how to serve small business. Need more upfront plans—but difficult under grant set up.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Partners Interview Guide

Name:
Organization Name: Company 2 (Blackhawk)
Position: Human Resources Director
Date of interview: September 2-4, 1997
Visit Number: 5

1. How satisfied were you with the project? Why?	Shut down during summer except for individuals—just now restarting. Also lost spring getting ready for Milwaukee conference. Computer courses.
2. How effective was the partnership between industry and the College?	Excellent—all attend meetings.
3. Did your expectations change during the course of the project? How?	Added course on time management for salaried workers. Original goal—GED. Wants training for support staff also.
4. What were your major disappointments?	None. Good support from union for fundraising for joint projects.
5. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	QS Certification—due to education and training in center—understood processes. Individual successes—see changes in individuals. Confidence. Computer courses lead to help in computer work and on floor. Anecdotal.
6. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	CDL accomplished through center. Upgraded computer skills. Self esteem. Helped them bid for more skilled jobs.
7. How cost-effective was the program?	Good—payback in QS certification.
8. How do you feel about continuing the project?	Wants to continue—wants to extend on own—wants additional courses. Go on with peer advisors.
9. Has the project helped the company with public relations (newspaper articles, TV, radio coverage, etc.)?	Articles in local paper—good publicity.

10. What changes do you see in the future that would change the needs of your workers for training?	More computerized—compounder, inventories, repairs, engineering—learn in center.
11. Has this project improved the company's training program? Examples?	Yes—individual workers brought back training program. Health and safety courses—not doing much but want to make more hands on.
12. Would you recommend this training program to your colleagues in other companies?	Certainly—referred to other company locations—also local HR groups. Looking for grants. Article in newsletter that goes corporation wide.
13. Other comments:	Wish grant period was longer—started 6 months late.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Supervisors/Training Director Interview Guide

Name:
Organization Name:
Position:
Date of interview:
Visit Number:

1. Name of Class	
2. Number of workers who participated	
3. How satisfied were you with the class(es)? Why?	
4. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	
5. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	
6. Has participation in the class(es) affected their chances for promotion?	
7. How much did the workers talk to you about the classes?	
8. How do the workers who participated feel about the classes?	
9. How do other workers feel about the classes?	
10. How do you feel about releasing workers from the job? How did you accommodate?	
11. How does this training compare with training the company has done or could do itself?	

12. Would you recommend the company continue this kind of training?	
13. What are the advantages and disadvantages of working with the College to provide this training?	
14. Other comments:	

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Supervisors/Training Director Interview Guide

Name:
Organization Name: Company 8
Position: Training Director
Date of interview: February 6-8, 1996
Visit Number: 2

1. Name of Class	Learning Center
2. Number of workers who participated	250 out of 2200
3. How satisfied were you with the class(es)? Why?	Generally. One woman is becoming a citizen.
4. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	More diverse workforce. If employees feel better about themselves, they will feel better about the company—translates to the job. Hired first Asian supervisor—a female.
5. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	Older black man sees a difference. Volunteered so he could get a promotion.
6. Has participation in the class(es) affected their chances for promotion?	No, because of union agreements.
7. How much did the workers talk to you about the classes?	Peer advisors, yes. Participation in safety word contests led to promotion of center. Had to return puzzle to center.
8. How do the workers who participated feel about the classes?	They feel good—feel better about themselves.
9. How do other workers feel about the classes?	No one should know who is going and why.
10. How do you feel about releasing workers from the job? How did you accommodate?	Difficult—on line, team environment (need relief workers). Do release for meetings—would pay over time for relief workers to release for class.

11. How does this training compare with training the company has done or could do itself?	Hands-on. Some team building, TQM, diversity—large group. Safety meetings—large group.
12. Would you recommend the company continue this kind of training?	Promoting it—believe it pays off.
13. What are the advantages and disadvantages of working with the College to provide this training?	Advantages: ideas, transition to college work (some are students there also), no red tape from MATC. Cost of MATC—initially paid 100%.
14. Other comments:	Wants more participation. Initially started center on own. The precedent is that mechanics get training on their own time. Incorporate ESL as part of safety.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Supervisors/Training Director Interview Guide

Name: HR Representative
Organization Name: Company 1
Position: Human Resources
Date of interview: February 6-8. 1996
Visit Number: 2

1. Name of Class	
2. Number of workers who participated	17-20 out of 60 hourly workers.
3. How satisfied were you with the class(es)? Why?	Yes—wants more although ESL is not needed. Increase in wages has led to stabilized workforce at higher level. Likes whole-plant involvement—development, curriculum, training. Involved in improvement teams—builds trust, credibility.
4. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	Adds to culture—employee focused. Intangible benefits. Motivated for job advancement. Parent company giving money—double size of company. New technology and reorganization.
5. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	Emotional bank account—sincerely care about workers. Center supports the culture. Wants them to apply skills at home and in community.
6. Has participation in the class(es) affected their chances for promotion?	Yes—test for new position requires basic skills. If they show improvement and initiative, they are considered.
7. How much did the workers talk to you about the classes?	Yes, they ask about programs. Not too worried about confidentiality.
8. How do the workers who participated feel about the classes?	Positive.
9. How do other workers feel about the classes?	Don't feel they need help—don't know that work is changing.

10. How do you feel about releasing workers from the job? How did you accommodate?	Will do for job-related training, especially for down times. Maybe need to communicate more. Getting new computers with Internet access—for videoconferencing—will be incentives—also CD-ROM.
11. How does this training compare with training the company has done or could do itself?	Past training involved personal development for all (Covey). Communications skills. Job-forward technology. Difficult because basic skills that should have been taught in high school weren't there.
12. Would you recommend the company continue this kind of training?	Important to continue center—vital in expansion—needs to demonstrate return on investment to sell it.
13. What are the advantages and disadvantages of working with the College to provide this training?	Resources—writing curriculum, libraries, training in education, experience with other centers and adult learners. Only disadvantage is paperwork.
14. Other comments:	First peer advisor group reconstituted—was weak. Strategic planning should have happened earlier. Statewide conference—wants to see what other centers are doing. Needs to know success stories. The teacher does good job—communicates with all levels.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Supervisors/Training Director Interview Guide

Name: Supervisor 1
Organization Name: Company 10
Position:
Date of interview:
Visit Number:

1. Name of Class	GOAL
2. Number of workers who participated	
3. How satisfied were you with the class(es)? Why?	Overall the classes provided employees with the basic skills training they need. The strong point of the program is the instructor (Terry). We were able to work out any problems with little or no adverse impact upon the class. This resulted in a program that fits the needs of Company 10 exactly. Very favorable.
4. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	This is hard to answer with specific examples. Employees have said that classes help on the job. People who had completed GOAL and were enrolled in blueprint reading took a pre-test and didn't need basic math instruction. This allowed me to progress further with the blueprint class.
5. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	Self confidence because of success in the program. They have started to develop the team concept of working together toward a common goal. Morale has gotten better as a result.
6. Has participation in the class(es) affected their chances for promotion?	Without basic skills it is impossible to advance into higher-trained positions. Thus the classes help to open the door to future training and advancement opportunities.
7. How much did the workers talk to you about the classes?	They were very willing to talk about the class when approached.
8. How do the workers who participated feel about the classes?	Employees were happy to have the opportunity to sharpen or learn basic skills. We had some problems when class first started but with the employees' input, the classes were revised to give them the material in a form they liked and that had meaning to them.
9. How do other workers feel about the classes?	I don't think there were any negative feelings by other employees toward the class. The general feeling was one of "when do I get to attend?"

10. How do you feel about releasing workers from the job? How did you accommodate?	We had to balance the release of workers with our production requirements. This at times presented a problem, but the commitment to the class was made and held to. We found it was less disruptive to production to have people attend classes at the start of the shift.
11. How does this training compare with training the company has done or could do itself?	Parts of the basic skills training have been incorporated into classes in the past with mixed results. The approach of having all employees that have a common need work together toward a common goal has had better success. Reasons: 1) the people developed into a team, and 2) the classes were held away from the company in a far less threatening condition for the employees.
12. Would you recommend the company continue this kind of training?	I will and have recommended that we continue the basic skills training until all employees have been brought to the skill level needed to most efficiently perform our jobs.
13. What are the advantages and disadvantages of working with the College to provide this training?	Advantage: an instructor was available to devote time to Company 10. If we tried to have a Company 10 employee do this, there would have been conflicts with other job responsibilities. Disadvantages: 1) the school schedule and the company schedule are not the same. We work 12 months a year and don't have long summer vacations. This results in times when the employees could be in class but aren't. 2) We have people on three shifts that need training. Terry sometimes comes in off hours, but if we had to follow the normal school schedule about 1/3 of our employees would not be in the program.
14. Other comments:	

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Supervisors/Training Director Interview Guide

Name:
Organization Name: Company 1
Position: Manufacturing Manager
Date of interview: September 3-5, 1996
Visit Number: 3

1. Name of Class	(teacher's name) class
2. Number of workers who participated	
3. How satisfied were you with the class(es)? Why?	Yes—support for operator instructions—how to use work-order information. Worked with supervisors for developing pre-tests, developed the post-test survey (based on WESA). Workers more involved in process documentation.
4. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	Will benefit even more as they have need for more instruction. Don't do good job of communicating the importance of policies. They don't understand big picture. People don't understand how long training takes. They don't have good data or baseline—also difficult to sort out impact of program—also doing machine improvements, etc.
5. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	Attendance. They look at the learning center as a resource. People beginning to see need for training—they see the value. They like understanding the big picture.
6. Has participation in the class(es) affected their chances for promotion?	Yes, for individual participants, leads to increase in skills. Job related training, no. Expectation that they are taking on more responsibilities and becoming more valuable to the company.
7. How much did the workers talk to you about the classes?	None.
8. How do the workers who participated feel about the classes?	Positive.
9. How do other workers feel about the classes?	All hourly are involved. Office personnel not involved yet—opportunity.

10. How do you feel about releasing workers from the job? How did you accommodate?	Before and after shifts—paid for required training. Also allowed to use LC during work time if required by supervisor.
11. How does this training compare with training the company has done or could do itself?	Earlier training without the teacher—less prep, o pre and post tests, less consistent across shifts. The teacher is more efficient and organized.
12. Would you recommend the company continue this kind of training?	Yes—wants to involve The teacher in other training. Hopes training will continue—documentation of payback needed. LC—"nice to do" but business pressures are ongoing. Job related instruction important—structure and expertise.
13. What are the advantages and disadvantages of working with the College to provide this training?	Advantages: resources of college—referrals, software, materials. Difficult to get info on classes—help get enrolled. Opens up doors.
14. Other comments:	

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Supervisors/Training Director Interview Guide

Name:
Organization Name: Company 8
Position: Training Director
Date of interview: September 3-5, 1996
Visit Number: 3

1. Name of Class	
2. Number of workers who participated	About 300—12% at one time
3. How satisfied were you with the class(es)? Why?	Very—employee became citizen (very enthusiastic). Learned from focus groups that workers still unaware of learning center. LC newsletter every month—prize for safety terms.
4. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	Learning safety words from word search. Makes people feel positive about the company. If they feel better, the company will benefit.
5. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	Comfort level with computer. Feels okay about taking supervisor's place when gone
6. Has participation in the class(es) affected their chances for promotion?	No, union environment (based on seniority and knowledge).
7. How much did the workers talk to you about the classes?	Walks in door—people talk to him. Center being used for posters, gift cards, newsletters, etc. OK because helping self will help company.
8. How do the workers who participated feel about the classes?	Helps self esteem. Feel ownership in LC. Center maintained by students.
9. How do other workers feel about the classes?	They don't read the bulletin board or newsletter. They may be uncomfortable on management's floor.
10. How do you feel about releasing workers from the job? How did you accommodate?	No—only on own time.

11. How does this training compare with training the company has done or could do itself?	On the job training.
12. Would you recommend the company continue this kind of training?	Definitely.
13. What are the advantages and disadvantages of working with the College to provide this training?	Bring in other ideas, good networking, instructor training. No disadvantages.
14. Other comments:	Has many people turning in word search—indicator of participation. Wants classes but most people working 10 hour shifts. Some come in on own time on off days.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Supervisors/Training Director Interview Guide

Name:
Organization Name: Company 9
Position: HR Manager
Date of interview: September 3-5, 1996
Visit Number: 3

1. Name of Class	
2. Number of workers who participated	10% out of 160
3. How satisfied were you with the class(es)? Why?	Very. Low attendance. Workforce increased since January—closed summer. Should counsel them.
4. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	Students really like. Production and quality impacted, especially with problem solving.
5. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	Self concept, enthusiasm—pays off on job.
6. Has participation in the class(es) affected their chances for promotion?	Can use participation for advancement—promotion not guaranteed.
7. How much did the workers talk to you about the classes?	Wants them to think of program as employee-run—therefore, not much.
8. How do the workers who participated feel about the classes?	Great.
9. How do other workers feel about the classes?	Don't want to change—therefore don't participate.
10. How do you feel about releasing workers from the job? How did you accommodate?	Difficult—no classes can be cancelled without respondent's approval—came from president.

11. How does this training compare with training the company has done or could do itself?	Basic skills training—they do for themselves. Technical training applies to organization. Some classes cross over.
12. Would you recommend the company continue this kind of training?	Yes, thinks company will pay for it. Training will be ongoing. Program will be part of contract negotiations.
13. What are the advantages and disadvantages of working with the College to provide this training?	Advantages: college close by, good response time. Good contact person. Disadvantages: more control of employee.
14. Other comments:	Just starting peer advisors.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Supervisors/Training Director Interview Guide

Name:
Organization Name: Company 8
Position: Training Director, Safety Director
Date of interview: September 3-5, 1997
Visit Number: 6

1. Name of Class	
2. Number of workers who participated	
3. How satisfied were you with the class(es)? Why?	Very. Language barrier—putting signs and OSHA compliance in different languages. Self esteem—3 goals of EDP—leads to willingness to take classes and learn. Some have moved up—due to more confidence.
4. How did the company benefit (productivity, quality, safety, absenteeism, retention, etc.) ? Examples?	Safety record has improved—portion of credit to center (awareness of safety, language barrier). When injured, employee comes to center for light duty—helps Dave out with data entry.
5. How did the workers benefit (morale, attendance, teamwork, etc.)? Examples?	Some near retirement—to learn skills to use at home.
6. Has participation in the class(es) affected their chances for promotion?	Not directly—but have more confidence that they can learn. EDP leads to temporary supervision and training.
7. How much did the workers talk to you about the classes?	Conversation re safety contests.
8. How do the workers who participated feel about the classes?	Positive feedback. Peer advisors wear center logo on hat—good feedback. Peer advisors have worked well—they sell the center as a benefit.
9. How do other workers feel about the classes?	Time—done off clock. Operate 24 hours/7 days—operate 10 hours/4 days. Some come in on off day.
10. How do you feel about releasing workers from the job? How did you accommodate?	Not set up for this. 12 person team—affects output. Safety training done as a group.

11. How does this training compare with training the company has done or could do itself?	Use language they understand here. Type of injuries lead to identification of terms. Puzzles, etc. Focused on high-risk jobs. Picture book in different languages.
12. Would you recommend the company continue this kind of training?	Yes—will probably have to cut back—wants to get more union involvement—have union become more involved with center management. College will be involved in some way.
13. What are the advantages and disadvantages of working with the College to provide this training?	Disadvantage: College has lots of administrative needs that take away from students. Advantages: resources, sharing, visited other sites.
14. Other comments:	Retired workers come in for personal development.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Learner Interview Guide

Name:
Place of Employment:
Date of interview:
Visit Number:

1. Name of class:	
2. How satisfied were you with the class(es)? Why?	
3. What was the most important part? Least?	
4. What did you gain from the class?	
5. How did the class help you with your job? Examples?	
Reading	
Writing	
Listening	
Speaking	
Math	
Teamwork	
Other	
6. Did this class help you to understand the company better? Examples?	
7. Do you feel better about yourself as a worker as a result of this class?	
8. Did this class prepare you for a company training program? Which one?	
9. Did this class help you with getting a promotion or a better job? How?	
10. How did your co-workers feel about you taking this class?	

11. Would you recommend others to take the class?	
12. Did you get support from your supervisor to attend the class?	
13. Do you look forward to any more classes? Where?	
14. Do you do any more reading, writing or math at work than you did before the class? Examples?	
15. Do you do any more reading, writing or math at home than you did before the class? Examples?	
16. How did the class help you outside your job? Examples?	
Family	
Community	
Voting	
Other	
17. Other comments:	

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Learner Interview Guide

Name: 4 students
Place of Employment: Company 8
Date of interview: February 6-8, 1996
Visit Number: 3

1. Name of class:	Individualized
2. How satisfied were you with the class(es)? Why?	Good coaches.
3. What was the most important part? Least?	Learning different things—own pace and content. Open schedule. Free. One-on-one tutoring helpful.
4. What did you gain from the class?	Own goals. Computer applications.
5. How did the class help you with your job? Examples?	Computers and typing.
Reading	
Writing	
Listening	
Speaking	
Math	X Brush up; will help.
Teamwork	
Other	
6. Did this class help you to understand the company better? Examples?	Positive attitude toward company.
7. Do you feel better about yourself as a worker as a result of this class?	Self esteem—accomplished something. Line jobs are boring—can relax in center.
8. Did this class prepare you for a company training program? Which one?	Helped prepare them through typing lessons.
9. Did this class help you to get a promotion or a better job? How?	Difficult because of union—need college education. One person wants to get out, therefore is learning.
10. How did your co-workers feel about you taking this class?	No reaction. Some people don't care—don't realize they can learn.

11. Would you recommend others to take the class?	Yes—peer advisors. If they came for the introduction, they would have more.
12. Did you get support from your supervisor to attend the class?	Need to reach supervisors, especially through safety meetings.
13. Do you look forward to any more classes? Where?	Yes.
14. Do you do any more reading, writing or math at work than you did before the class? Examples?	Don't do much on line—some use of computers. More paperwork—not influence of the class.
15. Do you do any more reading, writing or math at home than you did before the class? Examples?	Typing at home. Using calculator. One person bought a computer.
16. How did the class help you outside your job? Examples?	One person bought a computer for home and helps sons with it. Another already has a computer at home.
Family	X
Community	
Voting	
Other	
17. Other comments:	Wants it to expand. Color printer. Full time teacher. 3rd shift.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Learner Interview Guide

Name: 9 students
Place of Employment: Company 8
Date of interview: February 6-8, 1996
Visit Number: 3

1. Name of class:	English and math.
2. How satisfied were you with the class(es)? Why?	Very.
3. What was the most important part? Least?	Better than MATC—not serious—working on GED. Scared of technology, but learning computers and typing. ESL. Free classes.
4. What did you gain from the class?	Computers—can help son. Mini-Spanish course—taking Spanish at Edgewood College.
5. How did the class help you with your job? Examples?	Computerized—typing, writing. Biggest draw.
Reading	
Writing	
Listening	
Speaking	
Math	X Learning packets
Teamwork	
Other	
6. Did this class help you to understand the company better? Examples?	Yes—safety words, English words—what to do and what not to do.
7. Do you feel better about yourself as a worker as a result of this class?	Yes—breaks up the day (comes to center on breaks)—don't want to stop. Feel good especially when on line.
8. Did this class prepare you for a company training program? Which one?	No, but values class.
9. Did the class help you with getting a promotion or a better job? How?	No, it's hard to get promoted. One person wants to get out of here and further education.
10. How did your co-workers feel about you taking this class?	They don't know about the center—bigger posters? One person was teased and got mad. Supervisors should encourage workers.

11. Would you recommend others to take the class?	Yes, but not everyone is ambitious. One has brought a friend.
12. Did you get support from your supervisor to attend the class?	Don't know. One person said yes, and has had her make signs. Another said no, supervisor said that he was in the learning center too much.
13. Do you look forward to any more classes? Where?	Yes.
14. Do you do any more reading, writing or math at work than you did before the class? Examples?	Computers, numbers. More paperwork on job. Work on computers.
15. Do you do any more reading, writing or math at home than you did before the class? Examples?	Homework. Using a computer to start a business.
16. How did the class help you outside your job? Examples?	
Family	X helping son, starting business, college homework.
Community	
Voting	X Citizenship (ESL)
Other	
17. Other comments:	Wants GED class. Wish had been here earlier. Need to learn more. Recommend keeping the center.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Learner Interview Guide

Name: One student (woman, Quality Control, on Steering Committee)
Place of Employment: Company 1
Date of interview: February 6-8. 1996
Visit Number: 3

1. Name of class:	Individual. Classes would be okay—not worried about confidentiality.
2. How satisfied were you with the class(es)? Why?	Wants blueprint class. Needs to use computer on job. Wants GED for job security—wants further education—wants driver's license.
3. What was the most important part? Least?	Open to any subject. Willing to learn with you if they don't know.
4. What did you gain from the class?	Satisfaction—able to get help. Class onsite. Convenience.
5. How did the class help you with your job? Examples?	
Reading	
Writing	
Listening	
Speaking	X Too little.
Math	
Teamwork	
Other	
6. Did this class help you to understand the company better? Examples?	Good knowledge before—appreciates that company wants to help. Employees have better morale. Julie gave help with resumes, although the respondent didn't switch her job.
7. Do you feel better about yourself as a worker as a result of this class?	Yes—wouldn't have thought of GED.
8. Did this class prepare you for a company training program? Which one?	Blueprint reading. Bought books on computer jobs—needs help.
9. Did this class help you with getting a promotion or a better job? How?	Perhaps—or higher pay grade.

10. How did your co-workers feel about you taking this class?	Some know—no negatives.
11. Would you recommend others to take the class?	Yes—to learn how to use computers. Afraid of computers--could learn here.
12. Did you get support from your supervisor to attend the class?	Definitely.
13. Do you look forward to any more classes? Where?	Yes.
14. Do you do any more reading, writing or math at work than you did before the class? Examples?	Not really.
15. Do you do any more reading, writing or math at home than you did before the class? Examples?	Do less—due to new classes.
16. How did the class help you outside your job? Examples?	
Family	X Self esteem—family and friends support.
Community	
Voting	
Other	
17. Other comments:	

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Learner Interview Guide

Name: One student, male, non-native speaker
Place of Employment: Company 1
Date of interview: February 6-8, 1996
Visit Number: 3

1. Name of class:	Computers
2. How satisfied were you with the class(es)? Why?	Taking computers 2 times/week. Spelling, reading. Helps on job.
3. What was the most important part? Least?	Learning how to type—helps on job. Julie.
4. What did you gain from the class?	Helps on job.
5. How did the class help you with your job? Examples?	
Reading	X
Writing	X
Listening	
Speaking	
Math	
Teamwork	
Other	
6. Did this class help you to understand the company better? Examples?	No, just learning to type.
7. Do you feel better about yourself as a worker as a result of this class?	Yes—will help later to get a better job.
8. Did this class prepare you for a company training program? Which one?	No.
9. Did this class help you with getting a promotion or a better job? How?	No.

10. How did your co-workers feel about you taking this class?	Ok.
11. Would you recommend others to take the class?	Yes—time is the issue. Has to drive back to Madison—is tense when he comes here after shift. Important that it's free.
12. Did you get support from your supervisor to attend the class?	Yes.
13. Do you look forward to any more classes? Where?	Yes.
14. Do you do any more reading, writing or math at work than you did before the class? Examples?	Better.
15. Do you do any more reading, writing or math at home than you did before the class? Examples?	Reading—read fitness magazines.
16. How did the class help you outside your job? Examples?	
Family	X Doesn't care—lives by himself.
Community	
Voting	
Other	
17. Other comments:	

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Learner Interview Guide

Name: Male, in 20s
Place of Employment: Company 2
Date of interview: February 6-8. 1996
Visit Number: 3

1. Name of class:	Math
2. How satisfied were you with the class(es)? Why?	Wants shop math—leads to skilled labor. Unskilled job now (90%). Very satisfied—has forgotten some things from high school—class very good.
3. What was the most important part? Least?	Continuing to learn and work on what he wants to do. Attends 3.5 hours/week. Works at own pace.
4. What did you gain from the class?	Is at bottom—wants to get better job. Probably not degree—wants basic skills.
5. How did the class help you with your job? Examples?	No, except feels better about himself.
Reading	X Later—wants to be well rounded.
Writing	
Listening	
Speaking	
Math	X only
Teamwork	
Other	
6. Did this class help you to understand the company better? Examples?	Yes—willingness to offer program causes a better attitude. Before shift, on own time.
7. Do you feel better about yourself as a worker as a result of this class?	Yes.
8. Did this class prepare you for a company training program? Which one?	No. He wants out.
9. Did this class help you with getting a promotion or a better job? How?	(not answered).
10. How did your co-workers feel about you taking this class?	They don't put him down—no negatives.

11. Would you recommend others to take the class?	Has been doing so. Only one on second shift. The problem is that the class is on own time and negative attitude of others.
12. Did you get support from your supervisor to attend the class?	Yes—can come back if laid off.
13. Do you look forward to any more classes? Where?	No.
14. Do you do any more reading, writing or math at work than you did before the class? Examples?	No.
15. Do you do any more reading, writing or math at home than you did before the class? Examples?	No, not yet. Does some homework.
16. How did the class help you outside your job? Examples?	
Family	X ok, better attitude, getting married in fall.
Community	
Voting	
Other	
17. Other comments:	Doesn't have the money to go to school—wants hands-on training, not academics.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Learner Interview Guide

Name: 6 students
Place of Employment: Company 9
Date of interview: September 3-5, 1996
Visit Number: 4

1. Name of class:	Problem solving, AC-DC Electric, Train the Trainer
2. How satisfied were you with the class(es)? Why?	Mostly voluntary time—some on company time, some shared time.
3. What was the most important part? Least?	Increased knowledge. Good instructors—open.
4. What did you gain from the class?	Leadership skills, self-esteem, knowledge, new perspective.
5. How did the class help you with your job? Examples?	Self esteem, cross training. Can now opt for learning skills since the learning center is on the job. Training is given based on seniority.
Reading	X
Writing	X
Listening	X
Speaking	X
Math	X Shortcuts with calculators
Teamwork	X Train the trainer
Other	
6. Did this class help you to understand the company better? Examples?	Product lines have changed—have to be more diversified. Learned idea of teamwork. Learn from others in group. Feel good about the company letting them take classes. Job related courses.
7. Do you feel better about yourself as a worker as a result of this class?	Definitely.
8. Did this class prepare you for a company training program? Which one?	Yes—AC-DC—because want knowledge of electricity
9. Did this class help you with getting a promotion or a better job? How?	Yes, due to skill mastery.
10. How did your co-workers feel about you taking this class?	Mixed—some teased, some supported. Some people not working on skills—they don't want promotions.

11. Would you recommend others to take the class?	Yes. Appreciates that they can take GED for self improvement.
12. Did you get support from your supervisor to attend the class?	Yes because this was supported by management and unions. Sometimes the supervisors can't let them go if they have to get out an order.
13. Do you look forward to any more classes? Where?	Yes.
14. Do you do any more reading, writing or math at work than you did before the class? Examples?	
15. Do you do any more reading, writing or math at home than you did before the class? Examples?	Math—checkbook, calculator, gambling. Using percentages for tipping, shopping. Varies by individual. Helps with family responsibilities.
16. How did the class help you outside your job? Examples?	
Family	X Problem-solving—has to deal with 19 year old daughter. Shares what learned in class with husband (GED)
Community	Teaching Sunday school, serves on church committees
Voting	Reading about candidates—checking out truth and past performance
17. Other comments:	Get t-shirts if in a certain number of hours. More skills leads to being better off in changing job market.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Learner Interview Guide

Name: 2 students
Place of Employment: Company 2
Date of interview: September 3-5, 1996
Visit Number: 4

1. Name of class:	GED, reading, math.
2. How satisfied were you with the class(es)? Why?	Very. Came in on vacation time.
3. What was the most important part? Least?	Able to learn in spare time. One on one tutoring. Wants to go, as opposed to school. Excited about learning.
4. What did you gain from the class?	High school equivalency. Realized that they can learn—thought they had lost that ability.
5. How did the class help you with your job? Examples?	Able to help co-worker with computer program—stopped him from screwing up a big program
Reading	X gives self esteem
Writing	X not directly on job—but may be later
Listening	X able to chair safety meetings better
Speaking	
Math	
Teamwork	
6. Did this class help you to understand the company better? Examples?	Company wants them to learn—they care about workers.
7. Do you feel better about yourself as a worker as a result of this class?	Yes.
8. Did this class prepare you for a company training program? Which one?	Both want to work on computers. Goal is to learn blueprint reading—will help. HSED—now can go into college.
9. Did this class help you with getting a promotion or a better job? How?	Yes, in future.
10. How did your co-workers feel about you taking this class?	At first, it was competitive—who can learn more? Fun. Gave encouragement and support.

11. Would you recommend others to take the class?	Yes—one has become a peer advisor.
12. Did you get support from your supervisor to attend the class?	Good support.
13. Do you look forward to any more classes? Where?	Hard to get education otherwise—can spare hour here and there—set own pace (less stressful).
14. Do you do any more reading, writing or math at work than you did before the class? Examples?	
15. Do you do any more reading, writing or math at home than you did before the class? Examples?	More—haven't watched TV—can help son (makes her feel good). Has friends with computers—can understand. Woodworking—can now measure, couldn't before.
16. How did the class help you outside your job? Examples?	Wants to return to community what she has gained.
Family	X helped son with homework—proud
Community	X more responsibilities with church
Voting	X Both plan to vote
17. Other comments:	Fits workers' needs—determined by anonymous surveys

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Learner Interview Guide

Name:
Place of Employment: Company 8
Date of interview: September 2-4, 1997
Visit Number: 5

1. Name of class:	
2. How satisfied were you with the class(es)? Why?	Very—EDP, computers, Spanish, math, ESL tutoring
3. What was the most important part? Least?	Seeing center grow—seeing personal growth. Union support. Instructors. Diverse workplace. Flexibility—try to accommodate with hours).
4. What did you gain from the class?	Math—could take work home and work at own pace. Center open at any time—could do MATC homework and use computers. Training that is used on job—helps promotions.
5. How did the class help you with your job? Examples?	Software program for ESL—helps language and computer skills.
Reading	X for electric courses
Writing	X edit letters, memos to workers and supervisor
Listening	X ESL—better comprehension
Speaking	X ESL—learning to speak out in English, helps with teamwork. Better communication with Hispanic people.
Math	
Teamwork	
6. Did this class help you to understand the company better? Examples?	Yes—meet and work with different people—management and union. Shown what partnership can do. Difficult to take on leadership role because of large union.
7. Do you feel better about yourself as a worker as a result of this class?	Definitely. Self esteem spills over to other aspects of life. Growing and getting better.
8. Did this class prepare you for a company training program? Which one?	Yes, especially computers. Mechanical math program for MATC training—on your own level, not level of group.
9. Did this class help you with getting a promotion or a better job? How?	Based on seniority and skills—helps with latter. Better English leads to promotions.

10. How did your co-workers feel about you taking this class?	No negatives. Pleased when he got his GED. Impressed that people using center.
11. Would you recommend others to take the class?	Older workers now coming in. New hires packet—tells about center—also part of union orientation. Peer advisors good in promoting—increased usage.
12. Did you get support from your supervisor to attend the class?	Some do—peer advisors pushing supervisors to educate workers. Some supervisors are peer advisors. When line goes down, supervisor brings the line to center.
13. Do you look forward to any more classes? Where?	Yes. Enthusiastic.
14. Do you do any more reading, writing or math at work than you did before the class? Examples?	Yes.
15. Do you do any more reading, writing or math at home than you did before the class? Examples?	Do more reading than TV. Taking computers here has helped business at home. Difficult—work long hours outside of Company 8.
16. How did the class help you outside your job? Examples?	
Family	X Uses computer, helps spouse, own business
Community	X ESL tutor at MATC, union work
Voting	X read about candidates, citizenship
17. Other comments:	Peer advisors all unionized.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Learner Interview Guide

Name: 3 workers (1 peer advisor, union steward)
Place of Employment: Company 2 (Blackhawk)
Date of interview: September 2-4, 1997
Visit Number: 5

1. Name of class:	GED
2. How satisfied were you with the class(es)? Why?	Good—at own pace, don't lurk over shoulder, not pushed
3. What was the most important part? Least?	All important. Teacher especially—builds your confidence and self esteem, cheerful.
4. What did you gain from the class?	Math that missed when younger—need at work. Computers. CDL learning materials. Confidence in skills.
5. How did the class help you with your job? Examples?	Communications course planned for peer advisors and supervisors
Reading	X procedures (reading minutes in union meetings—used to have to bribe someone to read the minutes)
Writing	X spelling, punctuation, column in company newsletter
Listening	X listens more closely
Speaking	X confidence in giving opinion
Math	X formulation of chemicals—how to put on computer. Do inventory without help.
Teamwork	X worked in teams during summer—skills helped
6. Did this class help you to understand the company better? Examples?	QS 9000—understand papers. Already working on next level. Company must be certified to do business internationally.
7. Do you feel better about yourself as a worker as a result of this class?	Yes.
8. Did this class prepare you for a company training program? Which one?	Yes. SPC—pay for knowledge classes at Blackhawk and company—helped with reading and math. Center instructor helps students with training.
9. Did this class help you with getting a promotion or a better job? How?	It will—help with promotions. Don't really need GED—but it's best bet on getting another job. Very difficult to do on own.

10. How did your co-workers feel about you taking this class?	Classes are off the clock. Others ask what they're doing. No negative comments. Some people wish they had time and initiative.
11. Would you recommend others to take the class?	Yes, especially if they have computer problems. Some have followed through. Some borrow books.
12. Did you get support from your supervisor to attend the class?	Supervisors encourage workers and ask about progress. Happy when they get GEDs.
13. Do you look forward to any more classes? Where?	Yes—teacher worked with them on personal basis.
14. Do you do any more reading, writing or math at work than you did before the class? Examples?	Yes—with QS 9000—have to read bulletin boards. More responsibility. Center helped with safety committee work—did manual on computer at home.
15. Do you do any more reading, writing or math at home than you did before the class? Examples?	Hasn't watched TV—reads, works on computer, union activities, etc.
16. How did the class help you outside your job? Examples?	
Family	X helped kids with homework—influence on son
Community	X solicits donations, announces at tractor pulls
Voting	X keeps up on regular basis; jury duty
Other	
17. Other comments:	Wants longer funding period—hopes company will continue. More people want to come.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name:
Organization Name:
Date of interview:
Visit Number:

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	
7. What are the major disappointments?	
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	
10. What would you change in a future project?	
11. How has the college benefited from the project?	
12. How much support have you had from the college?	
13. How cost-effective was the project?	
14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	
15. Other comments:	

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: Project Directors (2)
Organization Name:
Date of interview: May 30-June 2, 1995
Visit Number: Preliminary

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	(not answered)
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	The response from the businesses. Each business provided a proposal. Most needed the program because of new technology—well-developed needs statements. Great instructors—willing to mentor. Made significant changes from last grant, ensuring customization. Peer advisor system was taken for granted.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	There are different policies for institutions among the colleges. Companies want more technical training.
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	It was good to align NWLP with state projects. Need to do more recognition and media events.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	Slow time between the application and the contract. Three companies were lost. Federal process worse than in previous years.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	There was a demonstrated link between the training and the company objectives. This has not been demonstrated in the past, although they had good testimonials. TV instruction—will it work? How will the computerized WESA work? Should there be state administration or local administration of programs?
7. What are the major disappointments?	There was a lack of structure in the classes, caused by a lack of program goals based on identified needs. Instruction was generic.
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	The distance—coordinating among multiple sites and participants. Delays from the federal government in new position replacements.
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	This is weak. Industry is the least active partner. Management not buying into it—they have not been hit hard enough. However, once the program is in, they do institutionalize it. Wisconsin Mfgers & Commerce has no real role—statewide industry representative.

10. What would you change in a future project?	They would notify non-union companies that the union is a state partner. Then the union representative would have to be let in to the company. Reporting would be refined.
11. How has the college benefited from the project?	The Economic Development Departments have increased contracts—the program is a door opener for technical training. Better coordination with other parts of the college.
12. How much support have you had from the college?	Good—11 out of 16 involved.
13. How cost-effective was the project?	The program is cheap compared to contract services.
14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	A state-funded program for workplace literacy as been level-funded. They will continue without government funds. 14 out of 16 colleges do contract services. The state will continue TA and staff development.
15. Other comments:	(not answered)

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: Teacher
Organization Name: Company 1, serviced by MATC
Date of interview: February 6-8, 1996
Visit Number: 1

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	It's rewarding. It taught her.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	The learners. They like it once they come to class.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	Originally, they had ESL workers. They have left, and that caused a change. In November1995, new goals were set. Started with deadlines. SC works well.
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	There has been strong support from SC—all departments are represented. There has been support from corporate level.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	Low numbers of learners. This is a very small plant, only 60 workers. Some do not feel the need for the class. Others are embarrassed—they have to walk through the main office. Respondent spent time on the floor to help workers with basic skills on the job. Some came up for short mini-courses or individual tutoring. This was done on the clock.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	Everybody was trained. Work cells, etc. This helped on the floor with numbers. Reject charting—helped review.
7. What are the major disappointments?	The low numbers, although respondent did extensive recruiting.
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	Recruiting and paperwork.
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	Equipment was purchased by Company 1, so the continuation of the program depends on return on investment at the end of the grant.
10. What would you change in a future project?	Respondent was brought in at the very beginning, and so workers see her as a Company 1 employee not as a representative of MATC.
11. How has the college benefited from the project?	Respondent did not know.
12. How much support have you had from the college?	This has been good. Sharon and Gail Dyer were helpful. Free courses.
13. How cost-effective was the project?	There is a 50% investment now—respondent is not sure.

14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	Respondent wants to rewrite operator instructions and involve the operators in doing so. She wants to enter work cells and train everyone.
15. Other comments:	(not answered)

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: Instructor
Organization Name: Riverside
Date of interview: February 6-8, 1996
Visit Number: 1

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	Respondent would rate program a 7 on a 1-10 scale. Surpassed expectations.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	The right staff. Speed. Mostly the innovation—starting a program from scratch.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	There are differences in methods, not goals. How to develop additional stakeholders? A critical mass is needed.
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	The partnership—MATC provided furniture, etc., the industrial park markets to the company. The institutional staff.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	The resources—trying to do too much with too little time. The profit-making center of the college—can it be maintained? The politics—external partners, space, etc. Overlapping goals need to be identified—credit, money, etc.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	They have become more formal in the set of deliverables—the curriculum. The workshop-based groups.
7. What are the major disappointments?	They do not have a marketer. Peer advisors cannot go to other firms. The industrial park does some marketing. Still questioning how to put a self-sufficient program center in place. The program said it would do too much—they projected 30 WESA, and have not done any. Respondent wants the utility company to underwrite the program—it would be good to have external entity fund it.
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	Saying no—cannot take on other initiatives.
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	This is good—the program also uses state funds. Labor wants a more formal presence.
10. What would you change in a future project?	There would be a more specific implementation plan that would visualize the needed steps. (Respondent says that he is not good at details.) Respondent would like to see a center at a neutral location that would serve all the potential students at the Industrial Park.

11. How has the college benefited from the project?	The college has gained visibility and external partners. It has been a positive learning experience. It breaks down barriers across different jobs within a company.
12. How much support have you had from the college?	MATC provided materials, computers, furniture, telecommunications support. The capital budget allowed $90K for computers, online courses (through University of Wisconsin extension). Respondent wants to teach more than basic skills with the computers. Needs to figure out how to bridge from foundational skills to technology.
13. How cost-effective was the project?	$75/person was charged. Real costs are probably higher. $6000 per company upfront.
14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	Respondent wants to make program self-sustaining. Wants underwriters who will not necessarily use the center.
15. Other comments:	

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: Project Director
Organization Name:
Date of interview: February 6-8, 1996
Visit Number: 1

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	The project is good except for the technology. All the partners attended a meeting that respondent missed. Meeting was productive.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	The open relationship with business and industry. The Manufacturing Association willing to validate proposed certification.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	There is agreement—it is part of the history. Almost all are going to continue the program after the funding is over.
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	Experience, long-term relationships. The university partner was helpful—for instance, showed them how to count outcomes and use the WESA computerization—part of the grant.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	The unstable economy caused project to lose sites. For instance, Company 12 had layoffs. Also, the workers had to work overtime and did not have as much time for class.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	The project is still in mid-process. The computerized WESA, the new data on new sites, the interactive TV (only at one site).
7. What are the major disappointments?	The technology. Lakeshore and Company 11 plant dropped from the technology. Fox Valley-Company 10 is the only site using video. Computer problems stem from lack of hardware.
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	The state-level partners—there was not much leadership or support. The AFL-CIO, the Manufacturers' Commission, the State Director of Vocational and Technical Education do not promote or further funding—they delegate it and forget about it. Therefore the program cannot move off grant funds. However, it still has $500K from the state.
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	This was excellent. Riverworks (a small business consortium) may join UW Milwaukee—would be a good partner. Respondent wants to put family literacy there also (modeled after Eau Claire workplace/family literacy program where they write IEPs for families and work on how they support each other in the family).
10. What would you change in a future project?	~~The labor unions have never brought in sites—why can't they do it?~~ The colleges have recruited.

The labor unions might have done more recruitment of business sites.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

11. How has the college benefited from the project?	The college helps with the liaison to business. They offer other training and postsecondary education. It's a good opening. There is a linkage to educational program and other services in the college.
12. How much support have you had from the college?	The primary support from the college has been good. They help to develop and staff sites. They contribute in kind with furniture, some computers, etc.
13. How cost-effective was the project?	The grant is cost-effective, contract services are not. The colleges have to make the project self-supporting. Respondent questions how many businesses can continue.
14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	Trying to reduce contract costs in order to be more competitive. This is hard—full time and part time teachers are both unionized.
15. Other comments:	Union Project Representative does what he thinks is important. Terry Bower is good at the local site. A high percentage of full time instructors is a good thing.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: Instructor
Organization Name: Company 2, served by Blackhawk Technical College
Date of interview: February 6-8, 1996
Visit Number: 1

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	Very—fantastic workplace. Respondent is very excited about the project. She has worked with workplace literacy since 1988. Management and union are working closely together.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	The cooperation. Accommodating all three shifts. Peer advisors come in before and after shift to work with computer assisted instruction. They also troubleshoot cards on the third shift. She is preparing a manual for peer advisors. She is also starting GED and math classes.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	Good. There is discussion on how to solve problems. The company and union are supportive.
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	Surveys that asked what was wanted in classes went out as payroll stuffers. The cooperation helped—the groundwork had already been laid, and the key players are still in place. There are 40 active students out of about 225 workers. 190 identified themselves on the assessment as desiring classes.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	Privacy, space, equipment (want more computer assisted instruction), the bottleneck at shift change (there are too many students at certain times).
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	The workforce recognizes the need for basic skills. They want GED.
7. What are the major disappointments?	See #5
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	The travel—the company is located 45 minutes from the college.
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	Yes—willing to provide extra money for additional instructors.
10. What would you change in a future project?	There are too many reports—that would be changed. There would be a more realistic definition of basic skills. Money would be used for what is needed. Out-dated computers and software would be replaced. Center would be made handicapped-accessible.
11. How has the college benefited from the project?	Goodwill, referrals for additional services, marketing.

12. How much support have you had from the college?	College is very supportive. They cover for the program when necessary. The college publishes good happenings at the worksite. College gave computers, although they were old.
13. How cost-effective was the project?	It was cost-effective. Program can draw on company resources. Respondent offers group instruction when a group emerges that wants particular material.
14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	The peer advisors should become peer mentors. She is designing a training manual to support them. The company is becoming more automated, and so she is going to offer transitional training.
15. Other comments:	She is working without a contract—this is unique to the college. She wants to bring in an answering machine. Terry Boynton, the liaison with Blackhawk TC, working here but not on grant funds. Retention is good. Group instruction features pre- and post- tests. Program has plantwide access. WRAT math and Career Reading tests used, as are CAI tests. Teacher observes and documents.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: Instructor
Organization Name: Company 8, serviced by MATC
Date of interview: February 6-8, 1996
Visit Number: 1

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	They are moving into ESL classes and safety training. Respondent uses different types of word puzzles with safety terms. Other classes include low-level, college-prep, college tutorial assistance, pre-technical training. She works with technical training instructors. She assesses teachers up front before technical training and on company time.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	Students' comments—some say that these classes stimulate them to go on in education.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	The curriculum does not have to be tailored to the company, but the company is more likely to use it if it is customized.
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	The center is open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. She listens to workers and tries to meet their needs. She met with supervisors and the union—this direct communication resulted in referrals.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	She was not here enough (works 12 hours/week). More personnel needed. The company is concerned about the high numbers of ESL students and safety, but will not send students to class on the clock. Therefore classes have less impact.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	Curriculum development was good—done in conjunction with supervisors. The new employee folder—policy, health info, etc. (given out by HR). Denny, the training director, is reluctant to give away job time. The GED completers were a positive outcome.
7. What are the major disappointments?	The union needs to be more involved. Basic skills could be pushed during safety training. Respondent was asked to explain the union to ESL students.
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	Balancing the project objectives and the company objectives.
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	This is very good, especially the dealing with supervisors. She likes the business/education combination.
10. What would you change in a future project?	More people involved in the development of the center—supervisors, union, etc. Union would play a more active role.

11. How has the college benefited from the project?	Project provides a transition to college classes. Good reputation among workers. The Technical Division has a good reputation with other companies.
12. How much support have you had from the college?	This is good—Sharon, materials, finances. MATC has offered free instructor training.
13. How cost-effective was the project?	Very—Company 8 has given lots of assistance (facilities, computers, etc.)
14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	Respondent wants to get more involved in the functions of the company. She became involved with one department (turkey/bacon and bacon bits) for level 4 evaluation. Wants to link needs to curriculum. Wants to begin with ESL and safety. Pushing for on the clock instruction.
15. Other comments:	(not answered)

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: Instructor
Organization Name: MATC, working with Company 1
Date of interview: February 6-8. 1996
Visit Number: 1

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	There is low learner participation, but most are involved with work processes. Good potential. Assessed 40 workers using three job-related assessments based on WESAs—good results, not much need.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	Able to highlight problems in company processes and paperwork. Progress is slow—helping with work station instructions. Getting committees together. Communication difficulties between engineer and floor.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	The company may pull the program if it does not get moving. Agreement takes time.
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	Good management buy-in—allowing them to tinker with company processes. Becoming part of training.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	Instructor was under-utilized, although she spent time on the floor. There are no big basic skills needs. There are no ESL problems. There is a labor shortage—jobs close to Madison.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	Operator instructions and MRP training (work flow) and discrepant materials reports—if this can be shown to have an impact on the company. Respondent is tracking this.
7. What are the major disappointments?	Center under-utilized. Basic skills deficiencies based on WESA.
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	Maintaining enthusiasm. Peer advisors have been replaced—they mainly market ABE and the center. If a problem is job-related, the employee can come in on work time.
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	This is good. It depends on this year. If the center can help with processes and new work station training (requisite skills), program will be retained. Supervisors and management are all young and offer good support.
10. What would you change in a future project?	The evaluation process should have happened earlier. Patrick (HR) led process.

11. How has the college benefited from the project?	The college has a good picture of industry—the pressures and basic skills demands. Contacts. Blending basic skills and technical training pieces—needed for future welfare to work.
12. How much support have you had from the college?	Respondent's time, some equipment, software. College very supportive—need contract work (short-term modules). College is moving in new directions.
13. How cost-effective was the project?	Revision of reject chart should create savings. They are tracking the dollar value.
14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	They are taking the program a year at a time and hoping it has a positive financial impact.
15. Other comments:	(not answered)

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: Project Director 1
Organization Name:
Date of interview: February 6-8, 1996
Visit Number: 1

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	Well satisfied—lost only one company because of lack of management commitment.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	Support from companies, excellent instructional staff, good college support, good people. A good beginning.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	There are no problems. There was an initial problem of union participation in non-union companies. Now this is okay—Union Project Representative does peer advising training in non-union companies.
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	Cash match represented a better buy-in (25%--50%--75% cash). Good personnel—companies have had say in hiring. The November meeting was good—coordinators and instructors worked hard on evaluation plans.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	The company work schedules—overtime allowed no time for class. The facilities in some cases were a deterrent. There was an initial problem with confidentiality—they have to get the word out. Paperwork for instructors for NWLIS was burdensome. Plus the extra reports for district and department. Tried to be flexible. Almost all problems were individual ones.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	Good numbers—ahead of proposed timetable. Levels 3 and 4—looking for impact—done by local college.
7. What are the major disappointments?	NWLIS—customer service good but system bad. They cannot handle 1200+ learner data—the system is "overloaded". They are using "chewing gum fixes."
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	NWLIS, the line between basic skills and non basic skills, especially with reference to computers (word processing, spreadsheets, etc.)
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	Good relationship—will continue.
10. What would you change in a future project?	Multiple year projects would be good. Reduce paperwork. Loosen up on basic skills definition. Push harder for release time on top of cash.
11. How has the college benefited from the project?	Technical training, contracts.

12. How much support have you had from the college?	Very—good public relations, seen as an advantage. All except one college participated in federal/state projects.
13. How cost-effective was the project?	Very—declining federal budget.
14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	Continuance of state funding (hopefully). Need workplace coordination beyond the grant. Structured classes rather than individual training.
15. Other comments:	Would like union to recruit—so far, all recruiting is being done by the colleges. Union does jump in when there are problems. Respondent does not want to use volunteers except the peer advisors.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: (none given)
Organization Name: Company 7, served by MATC
Date of interview: February 6-8. 1998
Visit Number: 1

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	Very—it's a personal and professional challenge. Respondent works _ time—also at Johnson Controls (in Industrial Park) in a self-sustaining position. Sue is full time.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	Collaboration among organizations, teamwork.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	"Interesting negotiations" are ongoing. This is okay as long as everyone is seeing the benefit to themselves.
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	Older industrial park—there are established relationships and collaborations. This became part of the working relationship.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	The peer advisor group was difficult because of the relationships between unionized and non-unionized workforces. Union Project Representative involved.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	Successful beyond grant—self-sustaining. Educational outcomes. Changes in companies. 100 students—grant promised 50.
7. What are the major disappointments?	120 companies in industrial park—program served 20. Wants all of them. Effective marketing is needed.
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	There was no model—they are creating it as they go along. Duane wants to document this.
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	WESA provided a meaningful linkage, not a generic one.
10. What would you change in a future project?	Team effort for instructional planning.
11. How has the college benefited from the project?	They get FTEs registered as MATC students. They collect information on new technologies and create curriculum.
12. How much support have you had from the college?	The college is invested in the project. They see the importance of small business. They provided funding.
13. How cost-effective was the project?	Very—businesses are charged $10/hour, about $75 per workshop

14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	More customization. WESA and National Skills Standards. More service to companies.
15. Other comments:	

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: One person who does Economic Development and contract work, a second who is the instructor for three companies
Organization Name: Company 3, Company 11, Company 12 , served by ?
Date of interview: April 29-30, 1996
Visit Number: 2

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	Company 11—good partner. Basic skills taught there. Company 12 —GED taught there on voluntary basis with some on-the-clock training. Company 3—most on clock, more job-specific training (metrics), computer literacy.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	Students. Payoff for the college—students taking other classes. Using the college for training.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	Basic skills are needed. Should be positioned as partnership effort.
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	Company 11—trying to get into for 10 years—internal training only. Then new training manager initiated contact—federal grant money was an incentive. Management committed—link to top boss. Instructors have personality and are adult-oriented. Peer advisor group can be good if building a center.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	Company 12 —company bought, downsizing. Union spearheaded project—meeting new president. Strong SC but not strong peer advisors. Voluntary participation. Marketing of the program—can be perceived as business'/management's program, and students do not go to get back at management.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	GED completion, cultural change, link of basic skills to the strategic objectives of the company, confidentiality—supervisors do not know who has participated—hard to measure. Year end survey—need to document.
7. What are the major disappointments?	Do not want traditional basic skills—want computer literacy. Lack of management integration into total training plan. Strategic plans ignore basic skills. Computers would be a way of selling basic skills to workers. Program internally publicized but some do not know about it. Constant, proactive recruitment is necessary.
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	Federal government reporting unclear. Time for record keeping. Level 3 and 4 evaluation.

9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	Strong partnership—may continue, with cutbacks. Have done contract training impact studies. Tested maintenance people—there are deficiencies.
10. What would you change in a future project?	Record keeping, redefinition of basic skills to include computer literacy, technical skills, blueprint reading.
11. How has the college benefited from the project?	New training centers in other companies by contract. Use learning centers as models. Open up resources of college to companies.
12. How much support have you had from the college?	Good. Technical Board support good—Project Director 1.
13. How cost-effective was the project?	Whether companies institutionalize—probably will continue. Best buy—a full service provider (11 staff at Company 11).
14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	School to work, more customer training, relationship with college will continue (opens up college resources), strategic plan for college—offer upfront assessments, basic skills center, etc., full service provider of just-in-time training.
15. Other comments:	All three learning centers have computer labs with PLATO, Modumath, various software. Print materials are generic. Company 11—WESAs, customized curriculum. Try to make relevant by using company's materials. Needs assessment of companies—cross consortium of deliverers (UW Ext., Technical College, private consultants).

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: 1 administrator, 3 instructors
Organization Name: Companies 5,6, and 7
Date of interview: April 29-30, 1996
Visit Number: 2

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	Company 7 is close to doing WESA. They have the strongest union, and therefore are going slow.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	Students report that the classes help them on the job. Spouses can be part of the class at Company 5—spouses must be accompanied by employee.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	Yes—peer advisors not meeting requirements now, bur were useful earlier. Company 7—training workshop to get more involved—need new focus.
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	Quarterly meetings—sharing—learning from each other. Related to Technical Board and federal government.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	Overcame deterrents. Delay in federal grants—Company 5 went ahead. Paperwork done by colleges—companies would not do it.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	Self esteem increased—payoff at home for students. Think tank in each county=peer advisors need to evolve.
7. What are the major disappointments?	Company 6 —opened learning centers at all plants. Needed to do upfront prep. Management buy-in was not as good. They now realize the importance of college support.
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	(not answered)
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	Strong resources across state. Purchased instructor from Moraine Park. Will continue—college has benefited in technical usage.
10. What would you change in a future project?	Definition of basic skills would be expanded. Recommend that computers be part of program—is basic skills part of workplace?
11. How has the college benefited from the project?	They have other companies and offer custom training, more so than in the past. They have developed true partnerships. Enrollments are going up—they refer workers and offer courses onsite. Interactive TV courses offered. There has been a discussion of the technical skills needed for students—focus groups with the companies have been held.

12. How much support have you had from the college?	Good—work together across sites. College tried to use full time instructors in workplace program. Carolyn sits in on SC meetings and has developed a new course.
13. How cost-effective was the project?	Instructor helped with company training.
14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	Company 5 will include more than basic skills—also safety training, and this will get larger. Company 6 also will offer technical training and safety. Company 7 plans to continue.
15. Other comments:	Instructor uses release form. Pricing structure might eliminate connection—becoming part of the mission of the college—perhaps lower costs. State indicators but local decisions. PLATO has done correlations with WESA.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: 1 instructor, 2 coordinators
Organization Name: WITC Indianhead, serving three companies
Date of interview: April 29-30, 1996
Visit Number: 2

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	Satisfied with numbers at Company 6. Able to customize at Pack-it. Offer GED prep at Company 13. In the process of doing WESA now—math and measurements. Open learning centers---come in whether instructor is there or not. PLATO is at Company 6 and Company 13, Modumath at Company 14(mastery learning). PLATO customized with routing handouts.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	Partners' involvement—selected instructor (on job for one year). Convenient for workers' involvement. Greg acts as cheerleader and coach—promotes lifelong learning.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	Company 14 was hardest—smallest number of hours, least cooperative, not easy due to HR director—lack of communication. Company 14 lags behind in peer advisors, etc. Purchased software under grant—hardware by company. 2/3 good agreement.
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	The instructor is the best in the state. Wisconsin Center of Education and Work materials and conferences helped to create a quick start. Given models, checklists, WESA, coaching from other technical colleges. Buy-in from employees—they attend voluntarily, not on clock.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	Classes not on clock. Paperwork—federal, state, plus local. Instructor does it all. Management buy-in—good thus far but could be better. Need more supervisors to refer people. There are funding questions—political upheaval leads to lack of stability (told they would not have second year funding but instead got extra) affected commitment to program.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	Companies more profitable. Facilitated cooperation between technical college and companies. Good publicity with open houses.
7. What are the major disappointments?	Company 14's lack of cooperation. See #5.
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	Three different companies with three different philosophies and goals. Not enough time to become part of company. 12 hours at two companies and five hours at Company 14—feel like outsiders—takes a long time to feel a part of things.

9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	Good but cost is a problem.
10. What would you change in a future project?	One set of paperwork. Binding commitment on part of company—other technical colleges do this. Need to establish criteria as part of contract—meetings, etc.
11. How has the college benefited from the project?	Earned FTE throughout Wisconsin. Improved reputation of college. Public relations. Instructor refers employees to other technical programs. Learned a lot from technical college association.
12. How much support have you had from the college?	Good. Can get career assessments, resources, etc., from college. New to college—would have been better if had been employee.
13. How cost-effective was the project?	Combined three project instructor positions into one full time instructor position. Eliminated waste, etc., in college—level 4 evaluation. Demonstrated how federal dollars were used to stimulate programs.
14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	Want college instructor for confidentiality. Need different way to charge—to be worked out by technical state board. May provide start-up and consulting but not on-going instruction.
15. Other comments:	Company 6 --left because of cost—but then local plant decided to continue—collaborative work team approach. Unemployment is low—need to upskill workplace for productivity. Has one state-funded project—used expertise from federal project.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: 1 instructor, 1 campus administrator
Organization Name: Company 4, served by Moraine Park
Date of interview: April 29-30, 1996
Visit Number: 2

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	Study skills, communications, math—generic, contextualized. WESA used to pick courses.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	People at Company 4 are enthusiastic and appreciative. Supervisors and floor workers all use program.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	Good.
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	Instructor was a key factor. Support of the union—they promote and recruit—15 peer advisors. Enthusiastic and positive. Employees built the room, etc.—it was their project.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	Purchasing of materials was limited. They have revamped materials from Moraine Park. Computers, word processing packages, Modumath. Self instruction packets.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	SC working on all four levels. Collecting anecdotes to publish in newsletter. More wanting to learn. Peer advisors active.
7. What are the major disappointments?	(not answered)
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	(not answered)
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	Good—relationship has been enhanced. Neutrality of education.
10. What would you change in a future project?	More technology in learning center—multimedia.
11. How has the college benefited from the project?	Improved relations with company—had worked with them before. Had done workplace literacy before. Company 4 better than others. Critical involvement of employees—ownership.
12. How much support have you had from the college?	Good—they helped train. Project Director1 helpful—set up procedures.
13. How cost-effective was the project?	Good participation frpm the beginning—cost effective. Doing training in learning center.

14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	Wants learning center to become training center—not just basic skills, but more integrated.
15. Other comments:	Manufactures farm machinery and light industrial—headquarters at West Bend. Good relationship with unions—only 1 strike in 60 years. Modules have assessments for level 2. Peer advisors taking over while teacher had a baby—management willing to hire substitute.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: 1 instructor, 1 campus representative, 1 B/I person
Organization Name: Company 10, served by Appleton
Date of interview: April 29-30, 1996
Visit Number: 2

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	More active SC and peer advisors.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	Students—able to engage in technical training. New peer advisors. Support from supervisors—help with WESAs and curriculum.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	Basic skills are a clear focus, especially math. Responsive to workers re curriculum, etc.
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	Upfront time—more knowledge, good involvement. Release of workers on clock. Peer advisors on work time. 50% cash match.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	Part time instructor—has two other jobs. Training manager difficult at times. Paperwork. Customization of instruction.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	High turnover led to study of retention (but low wages). Training for new machines and team approach and cross training.
7. What are the major disappointments?	Have to bug the company for match money. They didn't come to the meeting. Administration is lax and does not track hours.
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	Getting them to respond to paperwork.
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	No relationship with Company 10 before grant. Now doing supervisor/management training from college.
10. What would you change in a future project?	Clarified responsibilities, greater participation, less paperwork.
11. How has the college benefited from the project?	Most federal/state projects led to contract work in past. But pricing college out of market in long term. Future relationship with college rests on referrals.
12. How much support have you had from the college?	Good. Team meetings from different projects—support system. Leaders from different content areas network with other colleges—help with WESAs.
13. How cost-effective was the project?	Yes—part time instructor (cannot afford part time). All instructors work in regular college program.

14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	School to work—interested in having internships. College does youth apprenticeships with high schools to help new workforce.
15. Other comments:	Company 10 makes snow blower equipment. 2 computers and interactive TV (distance ed. for school to work). Broadcasting basic skills classes from college to plant. Non-union. Target reading, writing, math.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: Instructor
Organization Name: Company 15, served by Green Bay
Date of interview: April 29-30, 1996
Visit Number: 2

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	Mixed. Likes job. Feedback from peer advisors has been good.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	Peer advisors good. Recruitment. Starting newsletter. Computers. Group writing lessons. Student accomplishments.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	Ok—respondent feels need for support. Union president supportive and is on SC.
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	Peer advisory board and SC. Students—self esteem improved, payoffs at home. Book exchange of library books. Good support from Technical College—they visited and learned.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	Turnover in key people—management, peer advisors. Loaned computer from college with Modumath. Print materials.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	Awareness of learning center. Level 4. Personal goals accomplished—documented basic skills assessments. Keeping anecdotal records and self-reports—home centered.
7. What are the major disappointments?	Support from management—they are too busy trying to save company. Were not the decision makers that signed off on the grant. Asked workers to bring materials from job—poor response.
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	Lack of active management support. Company needs to see importance of learning center. There is only OJT—no formal training. A new machine caused workers to be laid off—but workers were not told.
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	Could be better. College supervisor aware of problem—is trying to meet with HR person. Good relationship—but needs more time from management.
10. What would you change in a future project?	More active support from management—they should come to SC meetings. They leave the respondent out of the loop.
11. How has the college benefited from the project?	They get referrals to courses. They do career counseling and assessments.
12. How much support have you had from the college?	Good. They will help to develop training for workers to use new machine.

13. How cost-effective was the project?	It may not be, but it is great for students.
14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	The company is in danger. It is expanding into international markets. They have to decide soon after contract.
15. Other comments:	Company makes packing tape. 84 workers on plant floor. About 1/3 participate voluntarily. Open 1 year—complete turnover in management. Older workforce—few promotions—workers do not want new learning or promotions. Did 4 WESAs—shared info with management—no feedback. Unionized plant. Respondent is on floor a lot and has good visibility. She has not developed curriculum from WESAs—uses generic materials. Not a contextualized curriculum.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: Campus representative
Organization Name: MATC, serving Company 8 and Company 1
Date of interview: September 3-5, 1996
Visit Number: 3

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	Company 8 and Company 1 very different. Company 1 is very small. Teacher is involved in company training. Personal development is okay, but needs to be brought into company training.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	Teacher's involvement with company. She is part of the business plan.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	There is clear agreement. Just looked at '96 goals—looking at '97 goals now. Considering evaluation plan of goals.
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	Committed company people—good involvement with key people (Company 1). Harder to pull in key people at Company 8 to move toward goals.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	Hard to pull people off the line at Company 8. Company 1—do training (paid) before or after shift.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	Pulling together Level 4 data—should be able to prove cost-effectiveness and return on investment.
7. What are the major disappointments?	Personal development of workers—not popular at Company 1. More could get a GED, etc. Need more job-related training at Company 1.
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	Staying on top of the project—would like more time with instructors.
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	Company 1 will continue if return on investment is positive. The issue is what is charged per hour for instruction.
10. What would you change in a future project?	Pulling together supervisors for informational purposes—they have to let workers go. Lower cost of contract training—respondent thinks this is too high. Have to recover all costs.
11. How has the college benefited from the project?	At Company 8, the college offers technical training and college instruction onsite. A teacher developed pre-tech math for courses. Good for MATC instructors to see the real world. There is a future for technical college instructors—relevant to work, at worksite, at convenient times (model).
12. How much support have you had from the college?	Alternative Learning Division is a bit of a stepchild. Positive visibility in college through workplace programs. Going by the number of workers served, workplace learning was the largest source of FTEs for

	the college. It's viewed as a growth area (has not been marketed yet).
13. How cost-effective was the project?	At Company 8, this is hard to measure because the course is not job related. They are looking at safety training for ESL learners.
14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	Expansion area—many employers have ESL problems.
15. Other comments:	Impressed with Colorado Community Colleges' curriculum—good topics. Vermont computer software is only on Mac. It's exciting for respondent to see workplace materials.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: Instructor
Organization Name: MATC, serving Company 1
Date of interview: September 3-5, 1996
Visit Number: 3

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	Slow during summer—working with company communications. Manufacturing Resource Planning—training session on manufacturing processes. Operator instructions—reviewed, did training on instruction, developed curriculum, doing training with supervisors, helped those who did not pass.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	Changes in attitude of workers—they did not like training even though they got paid for it. They did not appreciate the opportunity. Now they are positive about training and the center.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	SC worked on goals—total agreement. No union.
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	SC—involved in center.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	Recruiting—there is no interest in basic skills. Did company-wide assessment a year ago—there is no great need for basic skills.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	Working with training program. Keeping company competitive.
7. What are the major disappointments?	Peer advisors not involved on own time. Small workforce—word travels. Some hesitant to promote center.
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	None.
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	Could continue if they find the need for training. Voluntary program will not continue unless the numbers increase.
10. What would you change in a future project?	Should have done small groups, not whole shift. Workers are intimidated by job-related assessments. They are worried about being classified into different levels. Assessments showed that few people needed basic skills.
11. How has the college benefited from the project?	Workers taking more courses at MATC.
12. How much support have you had from the college?	Very good as a resource. People see respondent as a Company 1 person, not a MATC representative.

13. How cost-effective was the project?	Unknown. Low numbers.
14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	Continue work-related training for hourly workers and work cells, and technical training (pretesting, pre-tech, etc.). Will run for a year.
15. Other comments:	Training director wants CRTs of work-related basic skills for new hires. Company's Discrepant Materials Report of new work cells (with respondent's input) on instructions to comparable work teams. Turnovers and absenteeism are no longer issues, but this may be due to other factors.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: Campus representative
Organization Name: MATC, serving Company 8
Date of interview: September 3-5, 1996
Visit Number: 3

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	Surveyed union stewards and supervisors re needs. Then did separate focus groups—one per shift. Taking results to SC to get direction for learning center. The impact was that all the supervisors know about the learning center. Workers having trouble with computer scanning—respondent hopes to help train them.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	Some departments accept the center. More students are using the center.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	Bought into learning center idea—hired extra instructor. Good about materials. Pay for peer advisors' time.
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	Want computer skills—have to use them on job—has led to other programs. Marketing helped. More instructors—a company-paid person for computers.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	Supervisors change often. Started with one department—met with supervisor to determine needs. But supervisor did not follow up. Went to other departments with ESL workers—went with union steward—resulted in work-related ESL for small groups.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	Safety words on signs—translated in book. Followed up with survey to supervisors re impact.
7. What are the major disappointments?	Machine tool math did not take off. Should be before technical training—offered as mini-course. Sold to supervisor who sold to his boss—hope it works. Union not as active as it could be—better now.
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	Not being here enough—only 10 hours/week. Wishes she could float around plant more—do someone's job for a day.
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	Good—they are accommodating needs. Equipment, technical support, etc. Will continue.
10. What would you change in a future project?	Include supervisors more in start-up—this would result in more buy-in. Also more union stewards.
11. How has the college benefited from the project?	Learning center sends students to MATC for courses. College has a good name.

12. How much support have you had from the college?	Sharon offers lots of support. College is good resource. Respondent had been afraid to send students to counselors, but Sharon has a good one.
13. How cost-effective was the project?	Very—safety coordinator charts all accidents. Takes department working on ESL safety—compares it with a comparable department—looks at what it was also. Mostly same information.
14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	More job-related curriculum to get supervisor buy-in. More ESL—move on from safety. Career track—Company 8 will pay 60% of tuition. Strong relationship with union.
15. Other comments:	Personal development center—company wants happy workers. Initial materials—ESL and safety.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: Campus representative
Organization Name: Gateway Technical College, serving Company 9
Date of interview: September 3-5, 1996
Visit Number: 3

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	Trying to get peer advisors appointed—they will be released for training. Wants release time for students.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	Transfer of skills to home life. Interaction among students in small groups.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	Need peer advisors to bring input from floor. Respondent built close relationship with union—too much driven by management at first.
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	Consistency. Stuck to timetable. Having Gateway behind her as a resource—they have been supportive. The April conference gave her many good ideas.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	Too many people have to approve anything.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	Primarily individual outcomes. Self esteem improved. Flexibility—willingness to try something new. Camaraderie—team building (see others in same boat). Able to learn about the company.
7. What are the major disappointments?	Slow timeline. Lack of peer advisors on the clock before now.
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	Recruitment. Here only 10 hours/week—cannot track and recruit. Would like to work more.
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	Good. Wants to know how to do return on investment calculations.
10. What would you change in a future project?	Computer software as a recruitment and teaching tool. Peer advisors upfront. Company should commit to some release time.
11. How has the college benefited from the project?	Public relations—linked to counselors, leads to enrollment. Increase in contract training—Company 9 was receptive.
12. How much support have you had from the college?	Good. Student writing included in college publications.
13. How cost-effective was the project?	Does not know.

14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	Work on voting—elections. Written communications class. Web page on company—have students do research to have them create it—will allow them to work on writing. One computer is on the internet after hours.
15. Other comments:	No time to do WESAs—not mandated by grant. Wants to start ESL—though there is only a small need in the company.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: Campus representative
Organization Name: MATC, serving Company 8
Date of interview: September 2-4, 1997
Visit Number: 4

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	Very—good experience with workers and supervisors. People know her. Supervisors sending workers to center. They ask questions and prepare for future training.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	Helped people reach personal goals. Helped company.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	SC united in goals—goals have changed. Personal and company goals important. Personal Development Center.
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	Adding two instructors (one paid through grant, one paid by Company 8). Training director very supportive—comes to meetings, offers incentives.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	Respondent not on site enough. Working with weekend supervisor—added time on Friday.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	Had company develop a computer center. People achieve goals—she has documented anecdotal comments. Helped company—they now have safety meetings.
7. What are the major disappointments?	She was not able to work closely with major departments—very hard to meet with supervisors due to scheduling.
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	Keeping ESL workers in program. Starting "Each One Teach One"—paired with English speaker. Selling supervisors on this.
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	Very positive. Supervisors see value in learning center. Brought about by successes and word of mouth. Union could have been more supportive—union leaders are now in center.
10. What would you change in a future project?	Would start with a single department—tried to go company wide at first. (Supervisors left out of process in one department.) Then market to other departments by gathering data. Would use union stewards in survey to learn what is needed.
11. How has the college benefited from the project?	Workers attend MATC, as do their children. Contracts with MATC. Counselors have been to plant.
12. How much support have you had from the college?	Lots—personnel , resources, special needs staff when she needed help.

13. How cost-effective was the project?	Yes—at first wanted only "feel good" –how does the program measure that? Now she has safety data. Can measure impact on company—can gather level 4 data.
14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	Hopes to stay and wants to add hours.
15. Other comments:	Good to work with Training Director—he helps her connect with others in the plant.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: Instructor
Organization Name: Company 8
Date of interview: September 2-4, 1997
Visit Number: 4

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	EDP popular here. Less emphasis on computer training. More job-related. ESL began with safety terms—now in monthly newsletter.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	Evaluation leading to awareness.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	(not answered)
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	(not answered)
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	Training does not take place on work time.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	(not answered)
7. What are the major disappointments?	Weak union involvement in past—now there is a different person (Dave) who is stronger and involved.
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	(not answered)
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	(not answered)
10. What would you change in a future project?	(not answered)
11. How has the college benefited from the project?	(not answered)
12. How much support have you had from the college?	(not answered)
13. How cost-effective was the project?	(not answered)
14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	(not answered)
15. Other comments:	(not answered)

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: College coordinator, instructor
Organization Name: Company 2
Date of interview: September 2-4, 1997
Visit Number: 4

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	Best of various workplaces—more employee involvement. Likes peer advisors' ownership of program. Want to control program—leads to encouragement of participation, fund-raising activities, recruitment. Did Education Week with different activities, etc. Opened a Center bank account.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	Peer advisor involvement. Scholar Dollar—based on attendance at classes—got donations from company to purchase T-shirts, books, discounts. Critical thinking puzzles—have to get answers in center.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	Good—open, union and management working together. Union is the driving force because the company was facing downsizing.
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	Peer advisor involvement. Management open in sharing projected data—supportive. Allows workforce and union to lead. Accessible 24 hours a day—has not lost materials.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	Location—there is no better space for the center. Difficult to meet one on one—not private. Difficult to hold class and run an open lab.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	Complete GEDs, awareness of educational opportunities, plant manager used center to obtain CDL—good role model. Making difference in the lives of employees—also helped with job tasks at work site.
7. What are the major disappointments?	30% involvement—wish it would be 100%. Training not on company time—difficult for employees to attend.
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	Location of center, schedule (classes off clock). Smooth because they did a plant-wide assessment—led to better buy-in. Done at company and union request. Workers could find out their individual scores. Had better awareness over a couple of years.
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	Will continue. Level of funding questionable. Carrying on at 75% of costs. Center tutors workers who are taking course in pay-for-knowledge.
10. What would you change in a future project?	Nothing that they can control.

11. How has the college benefited from the project?	Public relations for college—done some separate contracting and employees are taking classes.
12. How much support have you had from the college?	Good support from division—good AV support from college. Contacted experts from college on technical questions and have done workshops.
13. How cost-effective was the project?	Hard to answer—more cost-effective at college—but reaching different participants. Would pay more if they went through continuing education at the college.
14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	Running longer because of shut-down for summer. Plan to continue center and partnership. Peer advisors will not let it die. May not be staffed fully—may use peer advisors more.
15. Other comments:	Locked mailbox—students can communicate privately—individualization of instruction. Most successful of workplace literacy programs of college.

WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
Workplace Literacy Project

Staff Interview Guide

Name: Director, assistant, supervisor of instructors
Organization Name: MATC
Date of interview: September 2-4, 1997
Visit Number: 4

1. How satisfied are you with the project?	8 on a scale of 10—highly challenging. Many different stakeholders—success comes from trying to create model for small businesses. Project forces people to think about areas left behind—new.
2. What are the greatest satisfactions?	Unique—learning from the program how to make it work. Number of hours quadrupled recently—took more than three years to implement. Helping small companies that did not know how to do training. Helping employees.
3. To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?	Yes, despite personnel changes. Consensus on goals and direction—process and ownership. Balancing act (NE Milwaukee Industrial Development Corporation vs. MATC on allocation of resources). Who owns the center? Who controls what's offered? Everyone wants freebies—how will center survive without grant?
4. What factors helped the success of the project?	Multiple stakeholders—partnerships are difficult but ownership keeps sense of it going. Strong peer advising. UWM Center for Economic Development has done helpful studies re market.
5. What factors acted as deterrents to the project?	Have to go slowly—one step at a time. Don't know what will work—leads to being spread too thin. Focus on common goals but difficult to meet all stakeholders' goals. Power differential. Company vs. business' goals and needs—all want services—grant money determines agenda. Organizational changes—NE Milwaukee Industrial Development Corporation and MATC.
6. What do you see as the major outcomes?	Small businesses are difficult to work with. Strategies of marketing. Economic viability—who underwrites and how much. Can't support center from small businesses only—need outside support.
7. What are the major disappointments?	Staff turnover in partnerships—Teaching factory now gone. Needs _ time administrator—laid off an instructor because they underestimated need. Marketing and coordination a problem—underestimated need. Perception that basic skills should not be paid for—willing to train on technical skills—better to have allied with Skills Standards and SCANS not education. "If schools were doing their job..."
8. What was the most difficult part of the project?	Start-up and sustainability hardest—need to build pricing, expectations, and roles at the front end. Need for constant evaluation. Politics of different

	stakeholders—territoriality, should those who pay have priority?
9. How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?	Yes, linkage will continue. Local foundation going to support. 1/3 for dislocated workers, 1/3 from businesses, 1/3 from community. Need partnership with NE Milwaukee Industrial Development Corporation. MATC pushing distance education—this center provides outreach to community and business.
10. What would you change in a future project?	Pre-certification of partners—get signed contract for money. Need more buy-in from businesses—needed stronger leadership. Need more variety—mostly smaller manufacturing companies here.
11. How has the college benefited from the project?	Visibility, FTEs, extending outreach capabilities, positive image—though also non-responsive, bureaucratic, etc.
12. How much support have you had from the college?	Tremendous—gave center a computer lab. College trying to serve business. Good linkages with enterprise development. Would like support from MATC in advertising, etc. Should be more involved—feel isolated.
13. How cost-effective was the project?	Middle of cost-effectiveness scale. Companies can't pay bills totally—need outside support. Think they shouldn't have to pay for training—think they support MATC through taxes. Need partners to provide resources.
14. What are your plans for the future regarding this program?	Same concept in NW area. Serve dislocated workers—companies going out of business. Perfect location for dislocated workers' center. Local foundation for welfare to work. Companies have needs—current companies can pay match now. In-house training center for companies onsite. Not going to increase costs to the companies after the grant—will underwrite in other ways.
15. Other comments:	Growth experience—"heck of a long experience." Small business is very different from big business. Learning center—buffet—has to serve everyone's interests and needs.

APPENDIX D

Summary of Trends

Partners Trends

How satisfied were you with the project? Why?
During visit one, all those interviewed were satisfied with the project. One respondent talked about being able to build on the strengths of previous projects, while another saw potential in the ability of the project to serve the workforce at her/his company. One person noted that networking would probably prove to be important to the project.

During visit two, those interviewed remained satisfied, although one commented that it would "take time" to establish a project that would fully address the needs of workers.

During visit three, two respondents mentioned that although they liked and were satisfied with the project, employees had been slow to participate. Primarily, the difficulty came from the fact that participants had to attend classes off the clock rather than on company time, unless the class directly addressed a work skill (blueprint reading, for instance.)

In later visits, the respondents noted more specific satisfactions. The development of the WESA technology, of curriculum, and of materials was positively commented upon. One respondent thought that the project could be replicated on a larger scale with more colleges and companies being included. This person also said that computers should be added to the curriculum. Two respondents noted concerns about the program's continuation.

How effective was the partnership between industry and the College?

At visit one, all respondents stated that the partnership between industry and the college was strong and improving. The college was said to be "a great resource for our center" and "the people we have worked with have done a good job." One person noted that "the colleges have some experienced educators who can bring together labor and management." In fact, two respondents talked about the need for a strong partnership between labor, industry, and the college; the union was said to have been instrumental in making this project successful.

During visit two, all respondents again commented on a strong industry/college relationship.

At visit three, respondents were again positive. However, one person said that the college should play a stronger role if it wants the partnership to continue. This person said that the companies, at times, tried to dictate the parameters of the project, and that the college should play a stronger role and try to be more responsive. Another person said that there could be more linkage between the colleges and the University of Wisconsin.

Did your expectations change during the course of the project? How?

At visit one, a respondent said, "My expectations changed in regards to how the delivery of services would take place. I envisioned a 'classroom' type

setting for teaching. However, our employee population prefers 'one-on-one' instruction so this is how we approach it." Others said that their expectations had not changed.

At visit two, one interviewee said, "Yes. When we entered the project, I was very unclear as to what the grant would actually mean for our company. As we moved through the project, I developed a better understanding of what our benefit would be under this project." Another respondent said that contrary to his expectations, student confidentiality was not a problem; in fact, students were proud of having their picture in the newspaper and felt a sense of ownership toward the learning center.

At one company, management had been pleasantly surprised with worker response to the center and had begun to see the center's potential for training. Several respondents noted that computers are the incentive for students to attend the center. It's a "bait and switch," said one partner. While students are learning computer skills, they are also learning critical thinking, problem solving and basic skills. One partner noted that the steering committee had "accomplished so much in a little time because the steering committee members work between meetings—they are committed."

At visit three, one partner noted that "some companies haven't seen the full possibilities for centers. [They] don't realize the need to integrate personal development centers and regular training...into [the] training plan." Expectations

changed when NWLP was "killed." One respondent said that as a result, networking and sharing did not take place except at conferences. Overall, the project proceeded more successfully than most partners expected.

What were your major disappointments?

At visit one, one respondent said that he did not believe the steering committee had sufficiently promoted the learning centers. Another expressed disappointment that some companies had dropped out of the original agreement, mostly due to their desire to dictate curriculum. This respondent also said that the grant stated that funds could not be used for other than basic skills; this person would have liked more flexibility. One respondent said that the project had proceeded as planned.

At visit two, one interviewee said that at his company, employees had not been willing to "recognize a basic skills need." This person said that employees were comfortable in their current positions and did not possess a sense of "urgency" toward learning new skills. In another company, a key HR person left, creating a delay before program implementation.

At the next visit, one interviewee said that the project did not seem to be "high on the State Director of Vocational Education's agenda." Delays in project implementation were again mentioned. One respondent said that it had been difficult for training

directors to see the flexible uses of the center and to integrate it with training needs. One partner noted that the inflexibility of the grant meant that computer skills could not be taught outside of the aegis of basic skills. At one company, it had been difficult to keep peer advisors in the loop, and therefore the company had not been able to implement that idea. Companies that dropped out of the project due to management turnover, lack of overall commitment were said to be disappointments. The lag time between grant proposal and funding was said to have affected management support for the project. One partner said that there had been good support from union for fundraising for joint projects.

How did the company benefit?

Most responses to this question contained anecdotal rather than numerical information. One respondent said that the project had improved management-labor relations. Another noted increased productivity and fewer counting errors at his company. A needs assessment of all workers led to group instructional areas and communities. They share samples and self-report, not test. They can identify where to begin WESAs. Good participation was noted.

One company, in the process of becoming QS 9000 compliant, said the program had been helpful in raising company standards so that the compliance could take place. The plant manager, and the union president worked together to get the company in the program. Standards in the in this particular industry had been rising, and education was said to be necessary so that employees could react quickly to customers' needs. Through the project, workers were becoming more trainable and more ready for additional responsibilities.

How did the workers benefit?

Most respondents noted an increase in skill level, self-esteem, self-confidence, worker morale, and communications as a result of the program. At one company, labor-management relations improved. Management thinks employee attitude is important. Assembly line production is boring—workers need other stimulation, including cross-training for promotion and flexibility.

Workers were said to appreciate the fact that the company provided training in a time when job content is changing. Anecdotal evidence indicated that improved worker morale led to retention.

Workers also reported improvement in home and community life as a result of the program. They were becoming more able to help spouses and children, conduct home business, and reach out to the communities in which they lived. Furthermore, workers not thus far involved in training program saw the improved lives of those who were participating, and this helped with student recruitment.

How cost-effective was the program?

Most partners said that the program was cost-efficient because workers "get high quality opportunity to upgrade skills in convenient location. Everybody wins." The grant money was helpful in starting various programs at one company, which was able to provide tapes/videos for remote locations/employees and offer the basic skills classes that were helpful for those who took advantage of these classes.

While no respondent had detailed ROI numbers to support the program's cost-effectiveness, most respondents "had a gut feeling" or "just knew" that their companies had benefited from the program.

Morale was said to have improved; one partner said that he believed many employees had stayed because of the training. One partner noted a decrease in workmen's compensation and a significant decrease in number of days out; time in learning center leads to getting back to work faster. Another company said there had been a decrease in learning curve for new employees by 2/3.

How do you feel about continuing the project?

Overall, partners reported positively in response to this question. Institutions are good at individual sites—and they always try to improve. Statewide, NWLP will hold together the project, and block grants will improve local service delivery. One partner said that the project would continue if labor were involved. Basic education is a cornerstone of HPWO—AFL-CIO in partnership with management. The project may continue on regional basis but may become fragmented; the need for state partnership and leadership was noted.

Some companies planned to continue training initiatives after grant completion. Two companies said that they planned to institutionalize the learning center, while one partner noted that her company planned to expand the learning center idea to a plant in another state. However, budgets for training depend on the overall success of the company in any given year. Most companies planned to continue a relationship with their partner college.

The federal program provided money for research, professional resources, development, networking; partners said that this money now needs to be provided at state level.

Has the project helped the company with public relations?

Most respondents noted that the project had helped with internal publicity. Learning centers had been mentioned in plant newsletters, corporate communications, stockholder reports, and company-wide meetings. Government representatives had visited some projects, as had upper management, human resources, and other high-level personnel. Union representatives made presentations to others about the project at conferences and meetings. Several partners reported that their centers had received television or newspaper coverage. Plant employees seemed to view public relations efforts positively and no problems with confidentiality were reported.

What changes do you see in the future that would change the needs of your workers for training?

Changes as a result of computer technology were most often cited. As companies acquired more computers and robotics, workers would need to acquire more technical skills, including computer skills that would allow them to use PC interfaces on machines. In the future, workers would need to be able to do basic computer troubleshooting, and have a modicum of programming knowledge. Higher math skills would

also be needed. One partner said that about 60% of workers at his company are unskilled, and that he anticipated less unskilled jobs to be available in the future. Companies seeking ISO 9001 or QS 9000 certifications were interested in making their workforces more trainable and compliant; they sought "knowledge workers" with a package of refined skills.

A respondent said that the unions need to prioritize technology. The future of the union rests on partnership. Job security is derived from personal development and training. Local unions need to be part of the partnership, and local union leadership needed to know more about the program. Another partner said that as the workplace changed to include more service jobs, more projects like this one could help with welfare-to-work, school-to-work, dislocated workers, and other transitional work programs. There should be more linkage between educational organizations and social services, government organizations, etc.

Has this project improved the company's training program?

Some partners believed that the project "added to and enhanced" what their programs were already offering. Participation in the project was said to make workers trainable and able to benefit from other company training. Some companies developed training ideas that integrated the learning center. At one company, the project provided the "kickstart" needed to begin a full-fledged training program. At another, monthly safety training was improved. A third partner

reported Improved completion of written materials (forms, job safety, etc.) Training efforts in general became more effective because workers learned and understood pre-technical skills. Technical training was modified using WESA information, and instructors helped to develop train the trainer programs.

Would you recommend this training program to your colleagues in other companies?

At all visits, partners said that they would recommend the program to others. One respondent said that if the process were streamlined and paperwork minimized, he/she could recommend the program. Other partners said that they had discussed the project with colleagues at other company branches, and that sister companies had expressed interest. Two partners mentioned that they needed to educate union leadership about workplace education programs, especially this one.

Trainer Trends

Interviewed twice: 1
Interviewed once: 6

How satisfied were you with the classes?
At visit one, a training director was generally satisfied. One worker at his company was becoming a citizen. Another respondent, a Human Resources director, said that he wants the center to offer more training, but that ESL was not really needed at his company. This respondent liked the fact that the whole plant was involved in the center's start-up, including development, curriculum, and training. A supervisor said that he was happy with the programs, and that the instructor and the basic skills training were very satisfactory.

At visit two, a manager said that he was very happy with the class. Workers were learning how to use work order information and were more involved in process documentation. A training director also expressed enthusiasm, but noted that he had discovered, through focus groups, that some workers were unaware of the learning center. A HR manager said that she was happy with the class but not with the low class attendance.

During visit three, only the training director interviewed in visit one and the safety director from the same company were interviewed. These respondents were very happy with the learning center. As a result of learning center intervention, safety issues were more directly addressed, worker self esteem had increased, and some workers had moved into greater positions of responsibility as a result of increased confidence.

How did the company benefit?

A training director said, "If employees feel better about themselves, they will feel better about the company, and this translates to the job." He noted that the class was a way in which the company could address the needs of a diverse workforce. The HR director said that the center adds to the company culture and promotes the belief that the company is employee-focused. Benefits were "intangible." A supervisor at another company agreed, stating that "employees have said that classes help on the job." At this person's company, people who had completed a basic skills math course were ready to take a blueprint reading class.

At visit two, a manager said that his company did not have good data measuring the program's impact. A training director said that people felt positive about the program and therefore about the company, hence the company benefits. A HR manager said that production and quality had been positively impacted.

At visit three, the respondents said that their company's safety record had improved due not only to an increased awareness of safety issues, but also because the learning center had addressed language issues.

How did the workers benefit?

A training director noted that one older worker volunteered for the class so that he could get a promotion. The HR director said that the classes created an "emotional bank account" for workers, letting them know that the company cared about them. The learning center supports the company's culture, and the company hoped that workers would apply newly learned skills outside the workplace as well as in it. A supervisor said that workers had increased self-confidence because of their success in the program, resulting in better morale and a greater ability to work in teams.

At visit two, a manager said that attendance had increased, and that workers were beginning to appreciate the need for training. He said that learners "like understanding the big picture" and that they were more able to do so as a result of skills improvement. A training director said that workers were becoming more comfortable with computers, and that some workers who had taken classes had increased their confidence to the point where they could perform some supervisory duties if the supervisor was not present. A HR manager noted increases in self-esteem and enthusiasm.

At visit three, the respondents said that older workers were learning skills that they could use at home.

Has participation in the classes affected workers' chances for promotion?

A training director said that most workers would not qualify for promotions because of union agreements. The HR director said that a test for promotions required basic skills; "if [workers] show improvement and initiative, they are considered." A supervisor noted that "the classes help to open the door to future training and advancement opportunities."

At visit two, a manager said that because of training, some workers were taking on more responsibilities and becoming more valuable to the company. A training director noted that the union environment hindered promotions based on other factors besides seniority. An HR director said that although

promotions were not guaranteed as a result of attendance, it was considered a positive factor for an aspiring worker.

At visit three, interviewees said that chances for promotion were not directly increased, but that workers with increased confidence and skills were more likely to be promoted.

How much did workers talk to you about the classes?
A training director said that peer advisors would talk to him about the classes. The peer advisors created a safety word contest that promoted the center: workers completed a puzzle and then had to return the puzzle to the learning center for a prize. The HR director said that he was not worried about confidentiality, and that workers often asked him about the center's programs. A supervisor said that workers were willing to talk about classes when approached.

At visit two, a manager said that workers did not talk to him about classes at all. However, a training director said that workers at his company talked to him whenever he visited the center. A HR director noted that since she "wanted the workers to think of the program as employee-run," she did not discuss the learning center with them.

At visit three, the respondents said that workers had talked with them about the safety contests.

How did the workers feel about the classes?
Workers feel good about themselves, and were happy to have the chance to sharpen or learn basic skills. In one company, the curriculum and structure of classes had to be revised as a result of student input.

At visit two, two managers said that they believed workers to be positive about the center. The training

director agreed, saying that the students "feel an ownership" in the learning center.

During visit three, the respondents said that they had gotten good feedback from workers about he classes. "The peer advisors have worked well. They sell the center as a benefit."

How do other workers feel about the classes?
A training director expressed a concern about confidentiality, saying that "no one should know who is going and why." Some workers, according to the HR director, do not feel that they need help despite the fact that their workplace is changing. According to one supervisor, workers in his company were waiting for their turn to attend classes.

At visit two, a manager said that all his hourly workers were involved with the center, and so there was no conflict between attending and non-attending workers. The training director commented that at his company, some people might be reluctant to attend classes because the learning center was located on the same floor as management. The HR director said that "some people don't want to change, therefore they don't participate."

At visit three, respondents said that although workers participate on their own time, most were enthusiastic about doing so. Some workers came in on off-days to participate.

How do you feel about releasing workers for classes? How did you accommodate?
A training director said that it was difficult to release workers during work time, as his company ran using a "team environment" and that he would have to enlist relief workers in order to accommodate learners. At times, his company would pay overtime for relief workers so that workers could attend meetings. The HR director noted that he would release workers if

the training was job related, especially during down times. A supervisor said that it was "less disruptive to production" to have students attend classes at the start of a shift.

At visit two, a manager said that workers attended classes before and after shifts, and were released or paid only for required training. Both the training director and the HR manager said that at their companies, students attended classes on their own time.

Again at visit three, respondents said that they do not release workers for training at the learning center.

How does this training compare with training the company has done or could do itself?
One company offers large group training on TQM, diversity, team building, and safety. Another offered personal development, communication, and job-related technology. Offering these classes was sometimes difficult, according to the HR director, because some workers did not have the basic skills needed to understand the material. In another company, parts of the basic skills training have been incorporated into past training programs, with mixed results.

At visit two, a manager said that previous company trainings had been less consistent than the current training. The HR director said, "Basic skills training they do for themselves...technical training applies to the organization."

At visit three, the respondents said that they had improved upon safety training as a result of the learning center and ESL classes.

Would you recommend the company continue this type of training?
One training director promoted the learning center at his company, believing that it "pays off." He wants to incorporate more ESL training into the safety classes. The HR director said that the center was "vital" to the company's expansion, but that he would need to demonstrate return on investment in order to sell the idea to upper management. The HR director also noted that at his company, the peer advisor group had had to be "reconstituted" and that he hoped

communication and strategic planning would improve. The supervisor said that he will and has recommended the continuation of the program.

During visit two, a manager said that he wanted to involve the teacher in other company training functions. He said that the learning center "was nice to do" but that he was not sure, given business pressures, of its continuance. The training director would "definitely" recommend the center's continuance. The HR director said that she thought her company will continue to pay for the learning center.

At visit three, the respondents said that the learning center would probably have to be cut back at the end of the grant. However, they were going to try to get more funding from the union, and have the union become more involve din center management. They wanted to continue the linkage with the college.

What are the advantages/disadvantages of working with the College?

A training director said that the center gave students the skills necessary to make the transition to college work, and that some students had already done so. The HR director noted that the college offered resources that aided students. Another advantage was the dedicated instructor who was not a company employee. A disadvantage noted by one company was the fact that the company's and the college's schedules sometimes did not mesh, and that college personnel were not available to serve workers on second and third shifts.

At visit two, the resources of the college were again mentioned. However, it was said that it was difficult for company personnel to get information on college classes and enrollment. A training director noted that the college provides good networking and instructor training, and that he saw no disadvantages to the association with the college. The HR director said

that the college with which her company was working was close by, and the response time and the contact person were good.

Resources were again noted as an advantage during visit three. However, the respondents said that the college had "lots of administrative needs that take away from students."

Learner Trends

28 learners interviewed over the course of the evaluation

Classes taken

Visit one: individualized instruction, English, math, "computers"

Visit two: AC-DC electric, problem solving, train the trainer, GED, reading, math

Visit three: EDP, computers, ESL, Spanish, math, GED

How satisfied were you with the classes? Why?

At visit one, several students who were receiving individualized instruction noted that they had had "good coaches." Those in group instruction were "very" satisfied. One person noted that she/he wished the center had been in place sooner. One ESL student who called his/her class "computer class" said that he/she was learning language skills that helped him/her on the job. A math student said that she/he was very satisfied with the class, and wanted more shop math because that would lead to a skilled labor job.

At visit two, a number of students reported satisfaction, although some complained about having to attend class on their own time.

At the last visit, students again reported satisfaction. The pace, and the fact that instructors "don't lurk over your shoulder" were mentioned as positive factors.

What was the most important part? Least?

At visit one, most important to a number of students were the open schedule, the individual instruction, the self-pacing, and the fact that the class was free. Students thought that the ability to work on GED and ESL skills, as well as the chance to learn the computer and typing, were important. The fact that the class was onsite and convenient were also mentioned. One person would like to see a blueprint class and a GED class added to the schedule at the center she/he attends.

At visit two, instructors were said to be important to student success. The ability to learn in one's spare time, the one-on-one tutoring was mentioned.

During the third visit, learners reported that they enjoyed seeing the learning center grow, and receiving support from instructors, supervisors, and the union. They appreciated the program's flexibility and the fact that the center was open at any time. At one site, the teacher was said to "build your confidence and self-esteem" and was noted as "cheerful."

What did you gain from the class?

Computer skills were mentioned by most of the students at visit one. One student said that he/she just wanted better basic skills because she he is "at the bottom." One student said that she/he had become motivated to take Spanish courses at a local college.

At visit two, students commented on increased leadership skills, self-esteem, knowledge, and perspective. One person had gotten a GED and become "excited about learning," saying that he/she thought he/she "had lost the ability" to learn before the class.

At the last visit, learners commented on the math and computer skills they had gained. An increase in skill confidence was noted.

How did the class help you with your job?

At visit one, computer skills, typing, and math were frequently mentioned. The math learning packets were said to be helpful. Reading and writing skills were also improving for one respondent. One person said that increased self-esteem had made him/her feel better about the job, but that he/she wanted "more hands-on training, not academics."

During visit two, students said that they had experienced increased self-esteem as a result of the classes, and therefore could function better on the

job. Students believed they had improved all of their skills. One student reported that because of his/her new knowledge of computers, he/she had been able to help a co-worker with a computer program, stopping the co-worker from "screwing up a big program." Reading better gave one student greater self-esteem.

At visit three, students reported that they were using all basic skills more on the job. Learners were now writing and editing memos, taking more training courses, and speaking out more because of improved listening and speaking skills. Math and computer skills had improved, and learners were able to help co-workers. One student mentioned that now that she/he could read better, she/he would not "have to bribe a co-worker" to read the minutes at union meetings. A communications course was being planned for peer advisors and supervisors at one company.

Did this class help you to understand the company better?
Some students gained a more positive attitude toward the company. Others valued the fact that they had learned safety words. Two people said that they appreciated that the company wanted to help the workers, and that therefore employees had better morale. One respondent said no.

At visit two, students commented about learning to work in teams, and learning more about the company's product lines. They "felt good about the company letting them take classes" and believed that what they were learning was job related.

At visit three, learners said they were able to talk with management and union people more, and communicate better with them. One student said that

he/she now understood what QS 9000 was about and that he/she was better prepared to help the company gain that certification.

Do you feel better about yourself as a worker as a result of the class?

Some students said that self-esteem had increased, as they believed they were "accomplishing something." A student said that she/he "would not have thought of the GED" without the influence of the class. One student said that since her/his job on the line was boring, the center gave her/him a place to relax. Another said that her/his visit to the center "broke up the day" and that she/he visited the center on breaks. One person said that these classes would someday help her/him to get a better job.

Reports of increased self-esteem continued at visits two and three. At year three, a student said that "self-esteem spills over into other aspects of life."

Did this class prepare you for a company training program? Which one?

A number of students said no, although they valued the class. One student prepared for additional training by improving her/his typing skills. One person prepared for a blueprint class.

At visit two, one student had prepared for an electric class, while another said that she/he was ready for a blueprint class.

At visit three, a student said that he/she had been able to prepare for a mechanical math program. This

person also mentioned that he/she was ready to take more computer courses. Another student said that management at his/her company was going to pay for advanced courses at the college.

Did this class help you to get a promotion or a better job? How?

At visit one, most students said that it was difficult to get promoted despite additional training, and so the class was not helpful in that regard.

At visit two, students said that perhaps these classes would help in the future. One respondent noted that he/she had gotten a better job as a result of skill mastery.

At visit three, a student said that promotions were based on seniority and skills, and so the class was helpful. This person noted, "Better English leads to promotions." Another student concurred, noting that "the GED is the best bet on getting another job."

How did your co-workers feel about you taking this class?

A number of respondents said that they had gotten no negative feedback from co-workers about their class attendance. Some students said that their co-workers had been apathetic about the classes. Others said that their co-workers did not know about the learning centers. One person was teased and got mad at a co-worker. Another said "supervisors should encourage workers" to attend classes.

At visit two, response to this question was mixed. Some students reported being teased by co-workers, while others were supported. Again, co-workers' apathy was noted.

At visit three, a student said that his/her co-workers were pleased for him/her when he/she received the GED. Another learner said that "some people wish they had the time and initiative" for study. No negative comments from co-workers were reported.

Would you recommend others to take this class?

Students said yes; if some of their co-workers would just come to one class, they would return for more. One person said, "Not everyone is ambitious." Another had brought a friend. Some students said that the class would be good for people who are "afraid to learn computers."

At visit two, yes. One respondent had become a peer advisor.

During visit three, one learner said that more workers, especially the older ones, were now taking classes at the learning center. The peer advisors were "good in promoting" the learning center. Students were especially enthusiastic about co-workers taking computer classes.

Did you get support from your supervisor to attend this class?
Reaction to this question was mixed at visit one, with some students saying said yes, while others said no. One person's supervisor told him that he was "in the learning center too much."

At visit two, supervisors were more amenable to classes, according to the learners. However, one respondent noted that "sometimes the supervisors can't let [us] go if they have to get out an order."

At visit three, supervisors seemed positive about worker participation in classes. The peer advisors had "pushed supervisors to educate workers" according to one respondent, who added that "when the [assembly] line goes down, the supervisor brings the line to the learning center." One student added that "supervisors are happy when workers get their GEDs."

Do you look forward to any more classes? Where?

Yes.

Do you do any more reading, writing, or math at work than you did before the class?

A number of students said that they used the computer more at work than they had before. They were becoming more able to cope with computers and paperwork on the job. Three said that they were not doing anything differently.

At visit three, one student said that with QS 9000, he/she had more responsibility and had to read more. This person also worked with the safety committee

and was able to do the manual for that committee on her/his computer at home.

Do you do any more reading, writing or math at home than you did before the class?
One student said that she/he was doing more typing at home, while another mentioned using a calculator more. A third person bought a computer for home use. One learner bought a computer and used it to start a business. One is reading more fitness magazines. One said she/he actually does less reading at home than before because of class demands. One person said no.

At visit two, some students noted they were more able to work with checkbooks, calculators and other home appliances. One reported being more able to handle family responsibilities, while another watched less TV and helped a child more. One student said that he could now understand a woodworking project. Another said that he/she was able to use his/her newly gained knowledge of percentages for gambling.

The story was much the same at visit three. Students reported watching less TV, helping children with homework, and conducting side businesses using computers. One person had become an ESL tutor at the local college and had become involved with the union. Students read more about candidates and prepared for citizenship tests. One person said that he now does the announcing at tractor pulls.

How did the class help you outside your job?
One person is now able to help her/his sons with computers, and another was able to learn to use a computer that she/he had already bought.

Visit one:
Family XXXXX helps son, increased self-esteem, better attitude
Voting X preparing for citizenship test

Visit two:
Family XX better communication with family, shares knowledge with husband, helps son

Community XX teaches Sunday school, serves on church committees, wants to return to community what she/he gained, does more with church

Voting X reading about candidates, plan to vote

Staff Trends

Interviewed 3 times: 3 people
2 times: 5 people
One time: 10 people

How satisfied were you with the project?
One teacher termed the project "rewarding" and said "it taught her." Another staff member said that it "surpassed expectations" for the first year, and rated the program as 7 out of 10. While one teacher said that she liked seeing "management and union working closely together," another noted that the program had "good potential" for growth. A third teacher said that she had been able to develop special curricula for her classes, which included low-level, college prep, and pre-technical training. A coordinator noted that her only criticism was the technology. Another respondent said that only one company had been lost from the project because of "lack of management commitment."

At the second visit, staff members mentioned that job-specific training had been well received by the companies, and they were doing more of it. Numbers were increasing at some companies, and additional classes were being added to the learning centers' schedules. One company had decided on a policy of an "open learning center" where workers could come in and use the facilities whether or not there was an instructor present. Peer advisors were becoming more a part of the program at several companies.

At visit three, one teacher was working with her company's communications department. Another staff member surveyed union stewards and supervisors about worker needs, and then did focus groups. The result was that all the supervisors know about the learning center and are sending more workers to it. A third teacher was petitioning for release time for students.

By the fourth visit, overall satisfaction with the project was reported. Some respondents stated that they believed the learning centers were becoming more accepted at the companies at which they were located. Workers and supervisors had gotten to know the learning center personnel, and the centers' missions were more familiar to everyone. At one company, job-related ESL had become more important. At another, the peer advisors had "taken ownership" of the project and had organized fund-raising activities, recruited new students, and begun small programs to encourage participation.

What are the greatest satisfactions?
Before the project began, the coordinators found a positive reception from business. Businesses seemed to want people who could work with new technologies. Significant changes, ensuring that business could customize the course material, were made.

At visit one, a teacher commented that the learners were her greatest satisfaction. A second teacher agreed, noting that some of her students "say these classes stimulate them to go on in education." Innovative, creative staff was mentioned by several respondents. A teacher said that she had been able to coordinate classes to serve workers on all three shifts, with the help of peer advisors. A coordinator said that the "open relationship" between business and industry was a satisfaction, while another respondent noted that the program had helped to address communications problems between management and workers at the plant where he worked. The collaboration among the organizations, i.e. the teamwork, was noted.

At visit two, students were mentioned by several respondents as the greatest satisfaction, with one company noting that the students were "enthusiastic and appreciative." Students were moving from classes at the companies to college and/or training courses. Some staff members from one plant reported that the company was allowing spouses to take classes with the workers. The partnerships were perceived as stronger by a number of the respondents. Students were able to engage in technical training and were getting more support from their supervisors at one company. One teacher mentioned that she had started a newsletter with her students, and that group writing lessons had been a success.

At visit three, one teacher discussed changes in worker attitude. She said that in the past, the workers had been negative about training but now they were positive about training and about the learning center. At another company, an increase in center usage by students was noted. The transfer of skills to home life was said to be a satisfaction by another teacher. A teacher noted that other departments within the company had come to accept the learning center more than they had in the past.

At visit four, staff members said that although the project had taken some time to implement, they were becoming more satisfied with the results. Teachers noted that students had begun to reach personal goals and that this was a great satisfaction to all involved. At one company, where the peer advisors had strongly contributed to recruitment and retention, a program called "Scholar Dollar" created rewards for class

attendance. In the same company, students had begun to work more on critical thinking. One staff person noted that the project had "helped small companies that did not know how to do training."

To what extent are there agreements on the goals among all stakeholders?

Companies seem to favor more technical training, and were more likely to use the curriculum if it is tailored to their needs. One teacher said that her company had originally perceived that the program would serve ESL workers, but that has not turned out to be the case. There are differences in methods, not goals. In year one, most of the stakeholders said that they planned to continue with the project after funding had ended. However, one company had already said that it was going to pull the program if it did "not get moving." Management/union problems were addressed in year one, and a union representative was allowed to visit non-union shops for this program.

At visit two, staff from one company noted that the peer advisor program "needed a new focus." (However, two other companies noted that their peer advisor programs had gotten stronger.) At another firm, management was said to be a hindrance, causing the program at that factory to "lag behind" others. One teacher noted that she felt she needed more support.

At visit three, a respondent who earlier had noted some partnership problems stated that "there is clear agreement" among the partners. Several other respondents who praised the efforts of the steering committee echoed this. A teacher, who commented that the company had begun to pay for more of the materials, as well as for the peer advisors' time, also noted more acceptance of the project.

At visit four, all respondents said that the steering committee had become "united in its goals." Unions,

management, and the college were working together to implement the project. At the same time, respondents had begun to wonder how the centers would survive without grant monies.

What factors helped the success of the project?
The partnership and the institutional staff were mentioned by a number of respondents as aiding the project's success. The participation of the university partner was seen as very important. The alignment of NWLP with state projects was seen as successful. Two staff members reported good management buy-ins. One company performed a needs assessment with workers prior to starting the class, which helped to lay the groundwork for the program. A learning center at one company stayed open 24 hours per day. Federal grant money was said to be an incentive for companies to participate.

During visit two, the quarterly meetings and the sharing among the partners was noted as a success. Instructors were hailed for their creativity and commitment, while the materials from the Wisconsin Center of Education and Work were said to be very helpful to programs. Increased union participation in the project led to the recruitment of 15 new peer advisors in one company. One company agreed to release its workers on the clock to attend class, and to allow peer advisors to do their jobs on the clock as well. A book exchange organized by the library was a success at one company.

At visit three, "committed company people" were said to be the key to success for one company's program. People at many of the participating companies seemed consistent in their efforts. However, at some companies, peer advisors could not be involved in the learning center on company time, diminishing their effectiveness as recruiters and mentors. At one company, the center responded to worker requests by

bringing in a company-paid instructor for computer skills training.

At visit four, the commitment of the stakeholders, the peer advising, and the assistance from the UWM Center for Economic Development were all said to have been instrumental to the project's success. Instructors had been added at some sites.

What factors acted as deterrents to the project?

At visit one, some staff believed that more media and recognition events should have been staged. The slow time between the application approval and the contract was a deterrent; three companies bowed out of the project. The federal process was said to be slow, "worse than in previous years." Also, some companies said that they had served a low number of learners. This depended in part on the physical location of the class as well as the company's decision to allow learners to attend class either on the clock or after/before shifts. Generally speaking, class attendance was lower if learners had to attend outside of work hours. Resources were also mentioned as being spare, especially time. The politics of the partners sometimes hindered the process. In two companies, layoffs precipitated by the unstable economy caused the remaining workers to have to work overtime, thus reducing the time they could spend in class. Teachers wanted more privacy, space, and classroom equipment. Paperwork was burdensome. The use of part-time teachers by some programs was seen as detrimental. Relations between union and non-union personnel were sometimes negative.

At visit two, complaints about the paperwork were again noted by a number of the respondents. The fact that the classes were not held on the clock at several companies was again mentioned. The purchase of materials was limited. One company had only a part-time instructor who could not complete all of the tasks assigned. At this same company, the training manager was said to be a hindrance. A turnover in key people at one company was seen to be a deterrent to progress.

During visit three, one staff member noted that although she would like students to be able to attend class during the workday, she realized that it was

difficult for the company to allow workers to do that. Another teacher said that although the grant called for basic skills instruction, there was no need for it at her company. One staff member said that since there was high turnover among supervisors at her company, she has a difficult time keeping the learning center mission in front of them.

At visit four, the tension between the companies' goals and the project purposes was said to be the greatest deterrent. There was a focus on common goals, but these goals conflicted at times. One instructor said that the greatest deterrent to success at her site was the fact that she was only paid to be onsite on a part-time basis. Another at the same company said that training did not take place on work time. At another site, the location, said to be "not private," was noted as a deterrent.

What do you see as the major outcomes?

At visit one, a link between the training and the companies' objectives was said to have been demonstrated. Previous projects had relied a great deal on anecdotal evidence. The curriculum was developed and formalized. One teacher was able to go onto the shop floor of her company and help workers with basic skills. Another teacher noted that her students were starting to recognize the value of the GED, while a third said that some of her students had completed the GED under this program. A staff member was tracking error reports and workflow to measure the impact of the program.

At visit two, one company commented on "GED completions, cultural change, and the link of basic skills to the strategic objectives of the company." Worker self-esteem had increased, with staff from one company stating that they perceived a "payoff at home" for students. One company said that it was "more profitable." Peer advisors became more active at one company, and helped to collect anecdotes of student successes. Retention and costs of training were being studied at one firm, while at another company, the teacher was documenting student success via anecdotal records and self reports from students.

During visit three, one staff member noted that a major outcome for her was "pulling together level 4 data." She hoped to use those data to "prove cost-effectiveness and ROI." Another respondent said that one of her primary objectives was to "keep the company competitive." One staffer said that ESL students were learning safety words that were immediately useful on the shop floor. One teacher said that outcomes were "primarily individual" and included increased self-esteem, flexibility, and teamwork skills.

At visit four, most interviewees said that the personal achievements of the students comprised the most major outcomes. One company had developed a computer center in response to requests from workers. Teachers at another company noted that several students had completed GEDs and others had become more aware of and amenable to educational

opportunities. In addition, workers were able to complete job related tasks more efficiently.

What are the major disappointments?
In year one, instruction was said to be generic, with a lack of structure based on vague program goals. Again, several companies mentioned low numbers of students. More marketing and planning was needed. A coordinator mentioned that the technology was not as successful as she had wanted it to be. Several respondents suggested that the unions need to be more involved. NWLIS was said to be "overloaded" and unable to handle data for the 1200+ students.

At visit two, companies had started to notice that students wanted computer literacy and skills more than they did traditional basic skills. In the words of one respondent, "Computers would be a way of selling basic skills to workers." However, since computer literacy was not a part of the grant mandate, traditional basic skills had to remain a priority. In addition, some companies seemed to be losing the management buy-in. One company's "lack of cooperation" was said to be a major disappointment. At another company, project coordinators "had to bug the company" for match money. Another firm had let their support for the project slip as the company's profits decreased and management became occupied with fiscal survival.

At visit three, a teacher said that she would like to see more "personal development" emphasis for workers; most of the training was work-related. Another staffer said that some peer advisors were "hesitant to promote the center" since they could not do so on company time. One teacher said that a machine tool math course she'd offered did not take

off, and that in the future she would offer it as a mini course before technical training.

During visit four, tension between the project and the companies created some disappointment. One teacher said that she had not been able to meet and work with supervisors from other departments, a problem she blamed on scheduling conflicts. Another at the same company noted that union involvement had been weak in the past but with a change of personnel was strengthening. An instructor at another company said that since her employees could not attend class on company time, it reduced her numbers.

What was the most difficult part of the project?
In year one, coordinating among multiple sites and participants was most difficult, as were the delays in the federal grant processes. Recruiting students was said to be difficult. Heavy paperwork got in the way of instruction, according to some teachers. State level partners did not display leadership or support to the extent that they could have. Balancing project and company objectives was a challenge. Again, NWLIS was mentioned as deficient.

At visit two, time lines and required record keeping were said to be unclear. One company's management was not buying-in to the project process, and so those who worked there reported that it was "taking a long time to feel a part of things." Paperwork was said to be difficult. At one firm, the "lack of active management support" was mentioned, as management seemed to be preoccupied with the company's economic health. At this company, there is no formal training other than what is offered by the project. At visit three, two teachers noted that their 10-hour per week schedule did not allow them to be on-site enough.

At visit four, one teacher commented that her greatest frustration was keeping ESL workers in her program. Another noted that the location of the center, and the schedule (with classes off the clock) made the program difficult for her. One staff person said that the project implementation should have been stronger with "pricing, expectations, and roles" addressed "at the front end." This same respondent noted that the "politics of different stakeholders" had made the project difficult to implement.

How do you feel about your linkage with industry? Will it continue?

Some staff members thought this was weak during year one. Management was showing reluctance to "buy in" to the idea of the project. The unions' role was vague, and labor asked for a more "formal presence" in the partnership. The linkage also depended on return on investment, in the form of less employee absenteeism, fewer mistakes, and higher productivity. Others, however, thought that there was an excellent linkage with industry, and thought that this would likely increase. In one company, if the center could help with training students to learn new work processes, it would be retained.

At visit two, some companies said that they would be interested in retaining a scaled-back version of the program unless significant ROI could be demonstrated. One teacher said this "could be better" as the human resources person in her company had been less than cooperative.

At visit three, a staff member noted that her company would continue the program if the ROI were positive. Another noted that her company was good at "accommodating the needs" of the project.

By visit four, most respondents were optimistic that the linkage would continue. It was said that the linkage with industry could have been stronger if the

union had taken more of a leadership role in the project from the beginning. At some companies, the hope was that the linkage would continue although, as one teacher said, "the level of funding is questionable."

What would you change in a future project?

At visit one, several staff said that the unions should play a more pivotal role in the project. Non-union companies should be notified that the union is a state partner; then, the union representative would have to be admitted to the company. One respondent noted that she was perceived as an employee of the company, rather than of her college, and would have liked that to be different. One respondent said that he would like to see a learning center built at a neutral location "that would serve all the potential students" at the industrial park in which his company is located. Paperwork and reports would be decreased, and there would be a more realistic definition of basic skills, which would include computers and technology. Evaluation should have happened earlier in the process. Multiple year projects were suggested. Loosen up on the definition of basic skills. Release time for workers was said to be needed in order to increase student enrollment.

At visit two, most staff members again called for the redefinition of basic skills to include computer literacy, with one interviewee stating that she wanted to see more multimedia technology in her company's learning center. A single set of paperwork would simplify the staff members' workflow, said most respondents. One staff member said that he would like to see "a binding commitment" between the college and the companies, and that companies should fully understand the parameters of that commitment before they enter into them. Another staff member seemed to agree, calling for "clarified responsibilities and greater participation" among the partners. A third called for "more active support from management."

At visit three, two teachers called for more communication with supervisors, so that they would

more fully understand the purpose of the learning center and would let workers attend classes. Another instructor said that since workers are "intimidated by job related assessments," she "should have done small groups, not the whole shift." One teacher would buy "computer software as a recruitment and teaching tool."

During visit four, a respondent said that the partners should have been "pre-certified" with written commitments to time, money and materials made by each company. Stronger leadership and more buy-in from company management were needed. One teacher said that she wished the union stewards had played a larger part in the project; they could have helped with recruitment and needs assessment.

How have the colleges benefited from the project?
Overall, the colleges gained visibility, external partners, and access to a pool of new students. The project was perceived as a "door opener" for technical training. College personnel were said to have been helpful to teachers at the companies. The project was regarded as a stepping stone to helping colleges address the needs of welfare to work.

At visit two, some staff mentioned that the colleges had developed a learning center model that could benefit other college/industry partnerships. "True partnerships" between the college and industry had been developed. Workers were moving from courses at the plant to training programs and college-level courses. Interactive TV courses had begun to be offered. Colleges' reputations had improved as a result of positive public relations. With one company, the college had established the "critical involvement of employees" in the project.

At visit three, a teacher said that at one of the companies where she works, the college offers technical training and college instruction on-site, as well as pre-tech math. More workers were taking community college courses.

At the fourth visit, it was noted that both workers and their college-age children had begun to attend classes at the colleges associated with this project. The college had gotten "good PR" from the project and had done separate contracting for training classes with some companies.

How much support have you had from the colleges?
During visit one, all respondents reported this to be good. One college provided materials, computers, furniture, and telecommunications support to the company with which it worked. Generally, in-kind contributions from the colleges were instrumental in making the project successful. One respondent mentioned that the college had helped in the public relations effort.

At visit two, the colleges were said to be "good" partners. Career assessments and other resources were made available to worker/students through the colleges.

At visit three, one respondent noted that the program was gaining "positive visibility" through its partnership with the college. Several spoke of the colleges as "very good as a resource" that offered "lots of support." Student writing had been included in some college publications.

At the fourth visit, personnel support was most often mentioned as the best support given by the college. Technical support was also noted, with computer support being most mentioned. One company

mentioned that it would have liked to have had more advertising support from the college with which it was working.

How cost-effective was the project?
The project was said to be "cheap compared to contract services." In year one, few were sure of the answer to this question, as return on investment had not yet been calculated. One company was tracking error reports and workflow.

At visit two, some companies had started cost conservation moves in order to maximize ROI. In one case, three project instructor positions had been combined into one full time instructor positions. Another company had started to do more of its training in the learning center. One teacher said, "It may not be (cost effective) but it's great for students."

At visit three, some companies did not note specific figures for cost-effectiveness, although there was a general agreement that the programs were cost effective. The safety director for one company, however, charted accidents and noted that there had been fewer accidents on the shop floor since the safety words classes had begun.

By the time of the fourth visit, the answer to this question remained uncertain. Data had been collected that had, in some instances, shown the project to have a positive impact on the companies. One company had collected safety data, which showed that workers were using safety words etc., on the job. It was noted that if the companies had contracted separately with

the colleges for the same training, it would have been more expensive and less cost-efficient.

What are your plans for the future regarding this project?
Overall, staff members hoped that the projects with which they had become involved would someday become self-sustaining. One teacher wanted to continue her commitment to working with learners as they worked on the shop floors, while another wanted to maximize the role of the peer advisors, renaming them "peer mentors." One coordinator noted that costs would have to be reduced in order to maximize return on investment. Two teachers said that they want to further link company needs to the curriculum. Taking the program a year at a time was said to be key.

At visit two, staff members from two companies said that school to work initiatives could be developed from the learning center model. One company said that it wanted to use the model to become a "full service provider of just-in-time training." One company planned to increase the scope of the learning center to include safety training, while another was to add technical training. One staff member said that a possible outcome would be that colleges would provide start-up consulting and assistance with curriculum development, but would not be involved in on-going instruction. One company reported that it wanted the learning center to become a "Training Center" offering an "integrated" set of work related skills training. One company was said to be "in danger" and therefore no future plans could be made at that time.

At visit three, one company was planning an ESL expansion area. Another said that it wanted to expand training to cover work cell and pre-tech training more extensively. One company wanted more ESL beyond safety classes. Another teacher wanted to incorporate

voting, written communications, web design, and research into her classes.

At visit four, interviewees hoped that the centers would continue, and that their missions would expand to include programs for dislocated workers and for welfare to work. Respondents said that the companies needed to continue the project even without grant monies. At one company, the teacher noted that the "peer advisors won't let it die." A teacher at another company hoped to stay on and add more hours to her schedule.